THE HISTORICAL POETRY

OF THE

ANCIENT HEBREWS.

THE

HISTORICAL POETRY

OF THE

ANCIENT HEBREWS,

TRANSLATED AND CRITICALLY EXAMINED

BY

MICHAEL HEILPRIN.

VOLUME I.

NEW YORK:
D. APPLETON AND COMPANY,
549 AND 551 BROADWAY.
LONDON: 16 LITTLE BRITAIN.
1879.

The Historical Poetry

OF THE

ANCIENT HEBREWS.

I.

The first unquestionably poetical lines which we meet with in the Scriptures are woven into a legend of the antediluvian time. They present a brief address of Lamech, a descendant of the outcast Cain, to his two wives, Adah and Zillah. Adah had given birth to Jabal, the father of all who dwell in tents and tend domestic animals—that is, the institutor of shepherd life—and to Jubal, the inventor of musical instruments. Zillah was the mother of Tubal-Cain, who invented the art of forging brass and iron, and of his sister, Naamah, of whom nothing is told, but whose name, 'the graceful' or 'the lovely,' bespeaks her beauty. Elated by the consciousness of the great advantage which the use of forged weapons, the work of Tubal-Cain, gave to his household, Lamech speaks boastfully to his consorts, alluding with disparagement to the divine

promise of vengeance for deadly violence which was to comfort his forlorn ancestor. He, Lamech, is now able to repel and avenge injury himself, most terribly. He says :

(Genesis IV. 23, 24.)

'Adah and Zillah, hear my voice ;
wives of Lamech, listen to my speech :
I slay a man for wounding me,
a youth for inflicting a stripe.
Lo, Cain would be avenged twice-sevenfold,[1]
but Lamech seventy-sevenfold.'

Some expositors, by more literally rendering a verb of the text, make Lamech boast of bloody revenge already taken. The difference is unimportant, for we have no history, not even a historical legend, before us. The originally mythical character of the whole account was long since recognized, and critically established.[2] The Hebrews probably received the tale, though in a different shape, from their neighbors the Phœnicians, who had carried the corresponding myths to Greece and Italy, or possibly had brought them from those countries. Jabal and Jubal—in Hebrew Yābāl and Yūbāl—are both identical with the Apollo of classical mythology, who was also known as Abelios in Crete, and as

[1] *twice-sevenfold*] See note A, at the end of the volume.

[2] Buttmann ably treated the subject, partly after others, in a university lecture delivered in 1811, and incorporated in his "Mythologus" (vol. i., 1828.)

Aplu in Italy. Jabal answers to Apollo Nomios, the god protector of flocks and herds, and Jubal to Apollo as god of song and music, and inventor of the flute and lyre. Tubal-Cain, the first forger of metals, is the same as Vulcan, the god of fire, who worked with anvil and bellows for gods and mortals. Tvalkin or Tvalkan, a word of Semitic or Aryan origin, may have been the original name, which the Hebrews modified chiefly by inserting a vowel, and the Latins by dropping the first consonant. Closely resembling it is the name of the fabulous Telchines of Callimachus, Diodorus, and Strabo, inventors of various arts, and the first workers in iron and brass,[3] who made the sickle of Saturn and the trident of Neptune. The bare mention of Naamah, as the sister of Tubal-Cain, strengthens the identification of the latter with the classical god of fire; for 'the graceful' corresponds to Venus, the wife of Vulcan.

Lamech's speech is evidently a fragment of a poem which celebrated the exploits, or related the fate, of the Cainites; a number of mythological figures of probably foreign origin having been converted in Hebrew tradition into historical characters of the antediluvian age. When and where the poem was composed, it is difficult to conjecture. The diction, which is simple, forcible, and pure, be-

[3] Diodorus (v. 55): *γενέσθαι δ'αὐτοὺς καὶ τεχνῶν τινων εὑρετάς*; Strabo (xiv. 654): *πρώτους δ'ἐργάσασθαι σίδηρόν τε καὶ χαλκόν.*

trays no archaic origin ; the parallelism of the parts agrees with the best models of Hebrew poetry. The strict versification is a sufficient evidence that the words attributed to Lamech were not composed, but copied, by the Scriptural narrator, who made no other actor in antediluvian history use purely poetical strains, not even the Creator himself in addressing the serpent, Eve, Adam, or Cain, though some of the solemn utterances are couched in semi-poetical expressions and forms. The address to Adah and Zillah is, besides, loosely connected with the genealogical record to which it is attached, while all the preceding or following dialogue pieces are strictly integral parts of the narrative. Poetically colored, though the narrator's own, are also the curse and blessings pronounced by Noah over his sons,[4] the oracle delivered to Rebekah,[5] and the blessings pronounced by Isaac over Jacob and Esau.[6] The poetical tone is chosen by the writer of these legends to add solemnity to the utterances. The Delphic oracles, too, were delivered in verse.

[4] Gen. ix. 25–27.

[5] Gen. xxv. 23.

[6] Gen. xxvii.

II.

It is, if not surprising, worthy of notice that not a single piece of poetry has been preserved in the Scriptures of which the subject is either Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, or Joseph, all of whom are heroes of extensive prose narratives, and all of whom were revered by the Hebrews as national patriarchs. Jacob, it is true, is introduced in a poem of a comparatively early age as addressing his sons on his death-bed, and in that address Joseph's excellence is celebrated in glowing strains; but no poetical production is specially devoted to the deeds or romantic vicissitudes of either. One of the psalmists, however, does late and scant justice to those interesting figures of hoary antiquity, by fugitively introducing them in a brief poetical narrative of early Israelitish history. Psalm cv. forms, with the two following, a historical summary, probably by more than one author, the first part of which is chiefly devoted to the Egyptian period, the second to the wanderings in the wilderness under the lead of Moses, and the last to the return of the people from the various countries into which their conquerors had carried them. The miraculous deliverances from slavery and captivity, and from the perils of the desert and the sea, the ungratefulness of the people, and the paternal kindness of God, are chiefly dwelt upon, and moralizing admonitions are

attached. Each psalm begins with the words 'Give ye thanks to Jehovah.'[1] The last of the three, as its contents show, was written at a time when the Jews, after their return from the Babylonian captivity, had already recovered from the manifold sufferings connected with the resettling of a desolated country. They had sown fields, planted vineyards, and reaped fruits, and both the people and their cattle had multiplied. Neither the style nor the tenor of the two preceding psalms proves them to be of an earlier origin. The first closely follows the Pentateuch, though in stating connected facts it allows itself both omission[2] and transposition.[3] It presents no original features whatever, and it is, in fact, little more than a fragment of a poetical catechism of Bible history. The whole psalm is smooth and plain, like the better productions of the latest periods of Hebrew Biblical literature. Here it follows:

(Psalm CV.)

(1) Give ye thanks to Jehovah,
call aloud[4] his name,
announce his deeds among the nations.

[1] The word *hall'lūyāh*, praise ye Yah, preceding *hōdū*, give ye thanks, at the beginning of Ps. cvi., is evidently a repetition, by mistake or for the sake of connection, of the same expression at the end of the preceding psalm.

[2] The fifth and sixth of the plagues of Egypt, as enumerated in Ex. vii.–xii., are omitted.

[3] Darkness, the ninth plague in Exodus, is here the first.

[4] The Hebrew expression 'includes two things, invocation and proclamation' (Moll).

Sing to him,
chant to him,
speak of all his wonders.
Glory in his holy name,
let the heart of all who seek Jehovah rejoice.
Inquire after Jehovah and his majesty,
seek his face evermore.
(5) Remember the wonders he has wrought,
his portents, the decrees of his mouth.
O progeny of Abraham, his servant;
sons of Jacob, his chosen ones!
he is Jehovah, our God,
his judgments rule[5] all the earth.
For ever he remembers his covenant,
the word he established for a thousand generations:
his covenant[6] with Abraham,
his oath to Isaac.
(10) He confirmed it to Jacob as a decree,
as an everlasting covenant to Israel;
saying, 'To thee I give the land of Canaan,
a portion allotted for possession'—
when they were a small number,
very few, and strangers there.
They migrated from nation to nation,
from one realm to another.[7]
He suffered no man to oppress them,
and reproved kings for their sake:

[5] *rule*] Literally, *are in*
[6] *his covenant*] Literally, *which he covenanted.*
[7] *to another*] In the original, *to another people.*

(15) 'Touch not my anointed ones,
harm not my prophets.'
He summoned a famine over the land,
broke all the staff of bread.
He sent a man before them :[8]
Joseph was sold for a slave.
His foot was forced into fetters,
he lay in iron—
until the time that his word became truth,[9]
and he was tried by the saying of Jehovah.
(20) The king sent and freed him,
the ruler of nations released him.
He made him lord over his house,
ruler over all he possessed ;
to bind his princes by his spirit,
to enlighten his elders.
Now Israel came into Egypt,
Jacob sojourned in the land of Ham.[10]

[8] *before them*] Before the Israelites, whom the famine forced to go to Egypt.

[9] *his word became truth*] Literally, *his word* (predictions, things predicted) *came.*

[10] Ham here corresponds to the ancient native name of Egypt, in hieroglyphic inscriptions Kem (Brugsch) or Kam (Ebers), in Demotic Kemi, a form preserved in Coptic. The Egyptian name signifies *the black*, referring to the blackness of the cultivable soil of the Nile valley, in contradistinction to the redness of the Libyan desert regions, which were designated *ta tesher* red land (Brugsch, Ebers); the Hebrew, *'hām*, means hot ; the corresponding Arabic root 'signifies "it became hot," and describes blackness as the result of heat' (Poole). Plutarch, in 'De Iside et Osiride,' renders the Egyptian

And he[11] increased his people greatly,
made it stronger than its enemies.
(25) He turned their heart to hate his people,
to plot against his servants.
He sent Moses, his servant ;
Aaron, whom he had chosen.
They displayed his signs among them
and portents in the land of Ham.
He sent darkness, and dark it became,[12]
and they opposed not his word.
He turned their waters to blood,
and killed their fish.
(30) Their land swarmed with frogs,
even the chambers of their kings.
He spoke, and there came stinging flies,
gnats spread over all their border.
He gave them hail for rain,
flaming fire in their land.
He struck their vine and fig-tree,
and broke the trees of their border.
He spoke, and locusts came,
and yeleqs,[13] without number ;

name by Χημία, and chemistry (χημεία in Suidas) has derived its name from that of Egypt.

[11] *he*] God, a word often similarly omitted in the prophetic writings of the Hebrews.

[12] The hiphil *ya'hshīkh* has here an intransitive meaning, as in Jer. xiii. 16 ; Ewald and Sachs translate accordingly, 'Er sandte Finsterniss und finster ward's.'

[13] *Yeleq*, according to Gesenius and Fürst, designates a species of locusts ; Keil, on Joel (i. 4), considers the word a poetical equivalent

(35) they devoured every herb in their land,
devoured the fruit of their ground.
And he smote all the first-born in their land,
every firstling of their strength.
And he brought them[14] out with silver and gold ;
there was no weary man among his tribes.
Egypt rejoiced when they went,
for their dread had fallen upon her.
He spread a cloud for a covering,
and fire to illumine the night.[15]
(40) They asked, and he brought quails,
and satiated them with food from heaven.
He opened a rock, and waters streamed,
flowed in the desert—a river.
For he remembered his holy word,
Abraham, his servant.
He brought out his people in joy,
his chosen ones in exultation ;
and gave them the lands of nations,
the labor of peoples to inherit ;
(45) that they might keep his statutes,
and uphold his laws.
Praise ye Yah.[16]

of *arbeh*, locust in general, but with this view the *v'*, and, prefixed to the noun in the sentence before us, is hardly compatible ; Credner, on Joel (*ibid*), sees in the yeleq the young, still hopping locust, in the last stage of its transformation.

[14] *them*] The Israelites.

[15] Literally, *to light by night.*

[16] *Yah*] One of the Hebrew names of the Deity, generally considered an abridged form of Jehovah (Yahveh).

III.

What is the historical value of the traditions concerning the Hebrew patriarchs, preserved to us by the author or authors of Genesis, and here and there alluded to by the prophets and psalmists?

Ewald, whose constructive and reconstructive propensity often prevailed over his critical acumen, was delighted to discover in the fourteenth chapter of Genesis a fragment of a really historical narrative, a true picture of the highest antiquity—as he believed—in which he saw Abraham in real life, free from supernatural associations, and waging war, 'of which, as not very befitting to a prophet and saint in the Mosaic sense, the other accounts nowhere give the remotest indication.' The patriarch, thus saved from the general wreck wrought by skeptical research in this period of Biblical history, appeared to him as one of the leaders of small bands of Hebrews advancing from the north toward Egypt, and at first rather sought by the older inhabitants of Canaan as serviceable allies in war; a migration which probably continued for centuries, resembling that of the Germans toward Rome, and of the Turks in the same Eastern regions in the middle ages. This, Ewald believed, was the historical hero of the Hebrews, whom the later legendary accounts of Genesis cast over into the type of a father, the

oldest of three, whose combination compares to those of Agamemnon, Achilles, and Ulysses, and of Anchises, Æneas, and Ascanius, and to similar type-triads of the East. 'Isaac stands beside Abraham, lower, but resembling him, under the conception of a son who in all things faithfully follows his father. Jacob is then introduced as the third of this series, though in a different character. He also, as father of the nation, is a type.' Historically, Jacob is conceived as another Hebrew chief from Mesopotamia, who arrives in Canaan with a fresh band of warlike followers, and restores there the Hebrew power, which, as the tradition of the feeble Isaac indicates, must have somewhat fallen into decay after Abraham's death. In the three names of Jacob's brother, 'Seir, Edom, Esau, we have a clear indication that the aboriginal race that called itself Seir was first subjugated by Canaanites bearing the name Edom, and then (together with the latter) by Hebrews bearing the name Esau.' Into such shadows of history are the exquisite pictures of Genesis resolved by the bold, yet comparatively conservative, criticism of Ewald.[1]

Kuenen, a historian superior to Ewald in solidity of judgment and logical consistency, bases his objections to a belief in the authenticity of the accounts of the patriarchs, even when detached from their mythical parts, chiefly on the circumstance that

[1] See his 'History of Israel,' translated by Russel Martineau, 2d ed., vol. i. p. 300 *et seq.*

they are 'founded upon a theory of the origin of nations which the historical science of the present day rejects without the slightest hesitation.' The Hebrews looked upon tribes and nations as families. 'The further they carried their thoughts back, the smaller to their ideas became the family, until at last they came upon the father of the tribe or of the whole nation, to whom, very naturally, they ascribed the same qualities as they had observed in the descendants.' They were so accustomed to this genealogical view, that in many of the Biblical pedigrees names of districts and towns are included as names of persons. The twelve Hebrew tribes who occupied Canaan and there formed a union considered themselves as the children of one ancestor, whom they named Jacob or Israel. Tribes most closely related to each other became sons of one mother; some of Rachel, others of Leah. Tribes, whose extraction appeared less nationally pure, were designated as children of the same father by handmaids to his legal wives. The Israelites and Edomites being known as closely kindred nations, Edom (or Esau) and Israel were made to be twin-brothers, sons of Isaac; the relationship which existed between these two nations and the Ishmaelites and other Arabian tribes was personified in Abraham, the common father by different mothers of Isaac, Ishmael; Midian, etc. In one word, the progenitors of tribes spoken of in Genesis are, as such, not real historical personages, but personifications; though,

'in the abstract, it is possible that such persons as Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob should have existed,' or that some of the incidents in the narratives of their lives should actually have been handed down by true tradition. Professor Kuenen states his points clearly and forcibly, and supports them by ample evidence; it is, perhaps, needless to add that neither argument nor evidence is new.[2]

Another representative of the now flourishing Dutch school of Biblical inquiry and Christian theology, Dr. Oort, not only fully adopts the Leyden professor's negative conclusions, but places them before a wider public with even less reserve, and some vehemence. That many of the features of the narratives in Genesis are 'invented' is evident, he says, 'for it needs no proof that stories in which a deity goes about with men, holds conversations with them, and even eats in their tents, do not give us accurate accounts of real events.' More than that: a close examination is destructive of the supposition 'that such men as Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and the rest did really live, and that the stories give us. on the whole, a correct account of their fortunes, though in an embellished and exaggerated form.'[3]

The Jewish historian Graetz, though tracing the history of his people back to 'its remotest begin-

[2] See Kuenen, 'The Religion of Israel,' translated by A. H. May, vol. i. ch. ii.

[3] 'The Bible for Young People' (in the American edition, 'for Learners'), translated by P. H. Wicksteed, part i. book i. ch. xi.

nings,'[4] entirely ignores the patriarchs as living and acting personages, barely alluding to them as subjects of popular Israelitish recollections. The historical worthlessness of these recollections, even if they really existed at the time of the exodus, is sufficiently made clear by the blank left in the national tradition between the time of the patriarchs and that of Moses—a blank extending over centuries. A few names only, without a single special event, were remembered in connection with the long period of subjection to Egypt, during which the house of Israel is said to have increased from an insignificant number of souls to two or three millions. What confidence can be placed in a chain of mythically embellished traditions, as a whole, in which there is a chronological break of such dimensions? There are, in fact, those who presume that the legends of Abraham's migrations and those of his grandson, which connect Canaan with Mesopotamia and Chaldea, were not original with the Hebrews, who came to the former country from Arabia, but were adopted by them, after settling in the Jordan regions, from stories of neighboring Semitic tribes, ethnically related to the nations in the Euphrates basin. According to this view, the name Hebrews (Ibrim), which designated *dwellers beyond* (the river), was not used

[4] 'Geschichte der Israeliten von ihren Uranfängen (um 1500),' etc., is the separate title of the first volume of his 'Geschichte der Juden;' the date shows that he places the 'Uranfänge' long after the period of the patriarchs.

in reference to 'the great river' of the empire of the Chaldees, but originally applied by the Canaanitish inhabitants of Western Palestine to their neighbors east of the Jordan.[5]

Seinecke, a writer who sympathizes with Kuenen both in history and theology, completes the latter's genealogical view by the following parallels: 'The Hellenes are descended from Hellen as the Israelites are from Israel. The tribal ancestor is the personification of the whole people, a general conception, a pure abstraction. There was not first a man Hellen, and many centuries later a people of Hellenes, but, on the contrary, only when the Greek people considered itself as a whole there was a national ancestor Hellen. . . . Only then there was a story of Hellen, and all the Grecian tribes, after centuries of internecine feuds, became fraternally united into one Hellenic family. All Israel was not divided into twelve tribes because Israel had twelve sons, but when the people had been organized in twelve tribes Israel had twelve sons. . . . Hellen has three sons: Æolus, Dorus, Xuthus; but as the Hellenes consisted of four tribes, instead of Xuthus, his two sons, Ion and Achæus, are reckoned as tribal ancestors. In the same way in Israel, Ephraim and Manasseh are reckoned as ancestors instead of their father Joseph. . . . Such genealogical tables are as sound as would be

[5] See Kiepert, 'Lehrbuch der alten Geographie,' p. 174; also Duncker, 'Geschichte des Alterthums,' vol. i. p. 357 (5th ed.).

the following: The ancestor of the German people was Germanus; Germanus had many sons: Saxo, Frisius, Francus, Suebus, and others, including the twins Schleswig and Holstein . . . . Saxo had three sons: Ostphal, Westphal, and Enger; Westphal had two sons famous in history: Osnabrück and Münster. In this table Osnabrück is the great-grandson of the ancestor of all the Germans. . . . In the ethnic table of Genesis, the city of Zidon, with its territory, is the first-born son of Canaan.'[6]

[6] See Seinecke, 'Geschichte des Volkes Israel,' vol. i. p. 1 *et seq.*

IV.

A. Bernstein, in his monograph on the patriarchs,[1] considers the legends of them to have originally grown up in connection with three localities, each of which had its own sanctuary and, as the seat of a peculiar worship, exercised a leading influence upon the surrounding region. The three places were Beer-Sheba, Hebron, and Beth-El, towns of the tribes of Simeon, Judah, and Ephraim, respectively (though Beth-El was originally allotted to Benjamin). Beer-Sheba was still known as a seat of idol-worship to the prophet Amos ;[2] Hebron had an altar of Jehovah at the time when David reigned in Zion, at which the king's son Absalom was allowed to sacrifice ;[3] Beth-El owed it probably to its pristine religious sanctity that it was chosen by Jeroboam as one of the two principal seats of the national worship of the northern kingdom, of which he was the first ruler. Each of the three holy places had its legendary patriarch, probably revered as such as early as the time of the judges. Isaac, the patriarch of Beer-Sheba, was apparently the oldest, and the least widely known. The recollections of him were dim and unimportant. Hardly any thing is told of him

[1] 'Ursprung der Sagen von Abraham, Isaak und Jacob.'

[2] See Amos, v. 5 ; viii. 14.

[3] See II. Sam. xv. 7 *et seq.*

that is not also told of either Abraham or Jacob, with little variation. His life is spent in the narrow sphere of Beer-Sheba and the adjoining part of Philistia. Of the older prophets, only Amos of Tekoa, a town little distant from Beer-Sheba, mentions his name. Isaiah speaks neither of him nor of Abraham ; Micah, who, unlike Isaiah, is fond of ancient reminiscences, ignores him while mentioning Abraham and Jacob together.[4] Abraham, the patriarch of Hebron, became the ancestral hero of Judah, whose capital that city was for a time. Jacob or Israel, of Beth-El, was the patriarch of Ephraim, of the later 'house of Joseph.' The legends of the three were not originally in harmony ; on the contrary, each patriarch was a distinct politico-religious figure, sharply contrasting with the other two ; each represented the political and religious ideas which prevailed in his region and tribe. The legend of the hero of Judah became more fully developed when David had extended the influence of that tribe and its national worship over all Palestine. Several features of the life of Isaac were transferred to his, Simeon having been absorbed by Judah, or having dwindled into insignificance. Rebekah, Isaac's wife, comes near being carried off by Abimelech, king of Gerar, a town of the Philistines adjoining Beer-Sheba : Abimelech, king of Gerar, actually takes into his harem Sarah, the wife of Abraham, and is only prevented by a miracle from dishonor-

[4] At the end of his book.

ing her.[5] Abimelech of Gerar goes with his general Phichol to Beer-Sheba to conclude friendship with Isaac: Abimelech and Phichol also make a covenant with Abraham at Beer-Sheba.[6] The naming of this place is attributed both to Isaac and Abraham, different reasons being assigned for the appellation in the two legends.[7] The legend of Abraham was expanded to embrace as a type the whole scheme of power and peculiar nationality which David and his son so successfully strove to found. His migrations extend from Mesopotamia to Egypt, all the land between which countries was to belong to the united Hebrew realm. His solemn purchase of the burial-ground of Machpelah at Hebron, gave a sanction to the possession of the first Davidic capital of the kingdom; his sacrifice on Moriah sanctified in advance one of the hills of the more splendid second capital, on which Solomon built the central national sanctuary. The same sacrifice was made the starting-point of the great reform which excluded human sacrifices from the national altars. His giving tithes to Melchizedek, king of Salem, hallowed the claims of the priests of Jerusalem. His victory over the four kings, which delivered the land from the sway of the great powers beyond the Euphrates, gave his descendants a claim to the gratitude of all the small tribes between

[5] Compare Gen. xxvi. 6 *et seq.* with Gen. xx. and Gen. xii. 10 *et seq.*

[6] Compare Gen. xxvi. 26 *et seq.* with Gen. xxi. 22 *et seq*

[7] Compare Gen. xxvi. 33 with Gen. xxi. 31.

that river and 'the river of Egypt.' The origination, attributed to him, of the rite of circumcision gave him a more sacred claim to the reverence of all the surrounding peoples that practised the rite. He is the father of Ishmael and Midian; his nephew, whom he protects and saves, is the ancestor of the Ammonites and Moabites; his kindred dwell in Mesopotamia. He is justly named a 'high father,' a 'father of a multitude of nations;' he builds altars, and propagates the faith of the Most High, the Creator of heaven and earth; he is a 'divine prince,'[8] just and generous—in a word, a glorious prototype of King David. What Abraham was to Judah, Israel or Jacob was to Ephraim and the tribes that sided with it on the secession from the Davidic dynasty. The narrative of his life was amply adorned to give a sacred coloring to the pretensions of the foremost sanctuary, the dynasty, the leading tribe, and the leading cities of the northern kingdom. The central point of the legend of him is Beth-El. There, when the place was still called Luz, he received the divine promise that the land should belong to his children; awe-struck, he exclaimed, 'Surely, Jehovah is in this place . . . this is no other but the house of God, and this is the gate of heaven;' and he erected a pillar, which should become the house of God, solemnly vowed to give to him the tenth of all he should bestow on him,

[8] Gen. xxiii. 6; see the Hebrew text.

and named the place Beth-El.[9] There he subsequently built an altar to God, who had ordered him to dwell at the place, and we have two new accounts of the change of its name. But not only the town in which was established the main sanctuary of the ten tribes had its name from Jacob; he also named several other localities, all conspicuous in Hebrew history, and all situated within the borders of those tribes: Gilead, the famous mountain range; its Mizpah, where the Transjordanic tribes assembled against the Ammonites, and elected Jephthah their chief; Mahanaim, where on the death of Saul his son was proclaimed king, against David; and Succoth and Peniel, both connected with Gideon's warfare, the latter also with the history of Jeroboam. At Shechem, a city of royal pretensions from the time of Gideon's son Abimelech, where the ten tribes renounced their allegiance to the successors of David, and Jeroboam established his seat of government, Jacob bought a piece of land, where he erected an altar, to which he gave the solemn name El-Elohe-Israel[10]—a distinct counterpart to the story of Abraham's purchase at Hebron. Jacob, at a time of need, goes to Egypt, and is cordially received by the Pharaoh: Jeroboam, before ascending the throne, fled to the Egyptian court, and his friendly relations with it may be presumed from the invasion of his enemy's, Rehoboam's, kingdom and cap-

[9] That is, House of God.

[10] El (the Mighty One, or God), God of Israel.

ital by the Pharaoh Shishak, which took place in the fifth year of the two rival reigns. The desire for friendly relations with the neighboring eastern powers on both sides of the Euphrates, which must have animated Jeroboam and his successors, finds its clearest expression in the story of the peace of Gilead, concluded between Jacob and Laban, the Aramean. Jacob's wives are natives of Mesopotamia; his favorite son is the benefactor of Egypt, receives an Egyptian wife from the Pharaoh, and she bears to him Ephraim, the ancestor of Jeroboam. Jacob is the brother of Edom: an Edomite prince, who, like Jeroboam, had escaped to Egypt, rose against Solomon before the Ephraimite plotted against him. Jacob is the father of all the Hebrew tribes; their names, some of which, like Gad and Asher, seem to have been borrowed from heathen divinities, and others, like Ephraim, to have referred to the peculiarities of the respective cantons,[11] are transformed into names of thirteen sons and grandsons of the patriarch. The tribe of Judah is represented among them, for it was to be reunited, by force or craft, with the ten tribes. That of Benjamin, under Saul and for a time after his death the deadly enemy of Judah, but finally terrorized into submission to the latter, is lured to change allegiance by touching accounts of special relations of blood and affection which once existed between the two sons of Jacob

[11] See note B, at the end of the volume.

and his beloved Rachel, Joseph and Benjamin. About Judah—whom, however, a later compiler, a harmonist, makes a special defender of Benjamin—scandalous accounts were invented, distinctly alluding to scandals in the court history of David. This part of Bernstein's critical discourse is so important, and in almost all its points so striking, that justice to the general argument, as well as to the author, requires that it be given here almost in full, in his own words :

'In the thirty-eighth chapter of the first book of Moses the fourth son of the patriarch is depicted in a light calculated to display the vilest stains on his character. Judah goes to Adullam, where he has a friend, Hirah. He marries a Canaanitess, the daughter of Shua.[12] The name of his eldest son is Er (ער). Er is wicked in the sight of Jehovah, and Jehovah slays him therefor. The name of his second son is Onan (אונן) ; he dies in consequence of sexual sins. The name of the third son is Shelah (שלה), and the enigmatic remark is attached to the name that "he was at Chezib when she bore him." Chezib is the name of a place, and the meaning of the remark may be that the mother gave a name to Shelah, because his father, Judah, happened to be absent from home, being at Chezib. But Chezib has also a different signification. The prophet Micah, who has a

[12] The Authorized Version has Shua in I. Chronicles (iii. 5), and Shuah in Genesis ; the latter form is an incorrect rendering of the Hebrew name, which is the same in both books.

superabundance of plays upon words for attaching political ideas to names of places, knows and makes use of this secondary meaning. Chezib signifies *deception*, *falsehood*, and is employed in this sense by the prophet (i. 14).[13] As Shelah serves in the narrative before us to deceive the just expectation of Tamar in regard to Judah, the allusion to Chezib is not at all far-fetched. However that may be, all the sons of Judah are described as bad. And now Judah himself turns toward evil ways, and is ensnared by his daughter-in-law Tamar, who acts the part of a harlot. Only thus Judah obtains issue, from which King David is made to descend, through Judah's son Pharez (פרץ), whose name designates him as a *breaker-through* or *in-breaker*, like which he is stated to have acted at his very birth, in regard to his elder brother.

'Veiled though this defamation is, it yet clearly shines forth as soon as we fix our view upon David's household. The picture of Judah exhibited in the libel strikingly portrays David himself. The Canaanitess whom Judah marries is none other than the Hittitess whom David married in adultery, murdering her husband, Uriah the Hittite (II. Sam., xi., xii.). Judah's wife is introduced as the daughter of one Shua. She is thus a Bath-Shua,[14] and is actually so called (v. 12). But Bath-Shua is Bath-Sheba her-

[13] Amos has the name Achzib, which also occurs in Josh. xv. 44; Achzib and Chezib are undoubtedly identical.

[14] *Bath* means *daughter*.

self, as I. Chronicles (iii. 5) distinctly tells us. The first son dies because God dislikes him, exactly as the first son of Bath-Sheba died (II. Sam. xii. 15). This son of Judah is stated to have been called Er (ער); why? because, read backward, the name signifies *bad*, *wicked* (רע).[15] The second son is called Onan (אונן), and perishes through sexual sins. He is none other than Amnon (אמנן), David's son, whose death is caused by criminal sexual indulgence (II. Sam. xiii.). The Tamar of the story of Judah is David's daughter Tamar, whom Amnon violated, and who, in spite of her misfortune and her purity, is here degraded to the condition of one acting the part of a public prostitute, her name being surrendered to shame in full. And Shelah (שלה), who dies not—insert one letter in his name, and you have Solomon (שלמה). The inserted remark about Chezib surely means to express that in this Solomon, a name expressive of peace,[16] nothing else is embosomed but the falsehood and deceit of David, his father.

'The Hirah whom the libel mentions as Judah's friend is probably identical with Hiram, king of Tyre, the friend of the house of David. To him is assigned the part of running about with a kid, and hunting after the dissolute women with whom his friend leaves as pledges the royal insignia, the

[15] Gen. xxxviii. 7 thus connects the two words: 'Er (ער), Judah's first-born, was wicked (רע),' etc.

[16] Solomon is in Hebrew *sh'lōmōh*; peace, *shālōm*.

signet, the cord,[17] and the staff. . . . The *pointe* of the story, the breaking through of Pharez, is a counterpiece to the violence exhibited by Jacob at his birth, a fiction of the Judaic legends. . . .

'Having thus unveiled the story of Judah, and discovered in it a bitter personal lampoon against David, we cannot be in doubt as to the source from which it sprang. We have before us a Jeroboamic production, directed against Rehoboam, and overflowing with gall and venom. And where does this libel find its place? In the middle of the story of Joseph, which is to glorify the Ephraimite. The narrator, who is just going to show us the ancestor of Jeroboam, the pure and chaste Joseph, in the house of Potiphar, interrupts himself at the right place, to exhibit to us first the counter-figure, the ancestor of the Davidic dynasty, in a picture of impurity ingeniously planned and elaborated, in which every person—each a fiction—reflects, and is to reflect, the shame of the house of David.

'That this lampoon has been preserved to us shows the great *naïveté* of the harmonists, men of a later age, who accepted so venomous a libel for a piece of history. . . .'

Other Jeroboamic inventions were the story of the outrage committed by Reuben—which coincides with

[17] *cord*] The Authorized Version has *bracelets*; 'but the Hebrew word here rendered "bracelets" signifies the *twisted* cord or ribbon by which the signet-ring was suspended' (Jamieson). Canon Cook, following Gesenius, Rosenmüller, etc., also substitutes 'cord' for 'bracelets.'

the infamy perpetrated by Absalom, David's son, when he took possession of his father's harem—and the story of the butchery committed by Simeon and Levi at Shechem. The main object of both was to show by what odious deeds the three oldest sons of Jacob forfeited the rights which the tribes called after them might, and probably did, claim on account of priority of origin. A secondary object of the former invention was to foster the remembrance of one of the most revolting crimes in the annals of the Davidic dynasty, and of the latter, to substitute in the memory of the inhabitants of metropolitan Shechem a fictitious massacre by two of Joseph's elder brothers for the general destruction of the city and its people by the tyrant Abimelech, the son of Gideon, of the house of Joseph. The composers of legends in Judah retorted by caricaturing the career of the patriarch of Beth-El, and it is they who applied to him the name Jacob, meaning the *deceiver*, *heel-holder*, or *supplanter*, while the Ephraimites bestowed on him the pompous name Israel, *victor over God*, or *God's champion*. Again and again Jacob cheats his brother; in their mother's womb he began to supplant him. The conflict of the legends commenced early and lasted throughout the period of great struggles between the kingdoms of Judah and of the ten tribes. When the rivalry between the two kingdoms subsided to a degree, the rival legends gradually became common property to the people north and south, and when the northern

kingdom was destroyed, they were finally entwined by harmonists into one family history, descriptive of the heroic age of the nation. The old legend of Isaac was included, and Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob became father, son, and grandson. Features were added, others eliminated, and combinations skilfully made, the whole process of harmonization resulting in what we now have before us in Genesis—a so-called history of the patriarchs. Yet, in spite of all the efforts of the compilers to produce a harmonious whole, numerous traces of the original contrasts remain, and repetitions, anachronisms, and contradictions abound. Thus, after being informed that God said to Jacob, 'Thy name is Jacob: thy name shall not be called any more Jacob, but Israel shall be thy name,'[18] which is in itself a repetition,[19] we read that God spoke 'to Israel,' and said, 'Jacob, Jacob.'[20] The earliest prophets had no interest in either Hebron or Beth-El, Jerusalem or Shechem; their central place, the centre of republican theocracy, was Shiloh, which, on the other hand, does not figure in the lives of the patriarchs. Amos mentions Isaac; Micah, Abraham and Jacob; and Hosea is quite familiar with the legend of the last-named, which probably existed in writing under the dynasty of Jeroboam, if it was not composed by that king himself. But Jeremiah is the first of

[18] Gen. xxxv. 10.

[19] *Cf.* Gen. xxxii. 28.

[20] Gen. xlvi. 2.

the prophets whose writings we possess to mention the three patriarchs together, in the common order.[21] An invocation of the God of 'Abraham, Isaac, and Israel' is put into the mouth of Elijah by a late historian,[22] and if the statement be correct, that prophet may have been the first of the harmonists.

This is a bold critico-historical combination, and it is as ingeniously executed in detail as it is bold in conception. The difficulties in its way are well understood by the critic, and many objections bravely met, and partly turned into supporting evidence. Not every feature is perfectly original, and many a point is still assailable; but the whole has justly made its mark, and it is beginning considerably to modify the earliest history of Israel, as well as the critical conceptions of the Pentateuch.[23]

[21] Jer. xxxiii. 26.

[22] I. Kings xviii. 36.

[23] Seinecke, in the first volume of his 'Geschichte des Volkes Israel' (1876), published five years after Bernstein's monograph, unhesitatingly and fully incorporates the results of that author's criticism; see the chapters on 'The Patriarchs' and 'The Tribes.'

V.

The foregoing is given in part as a fitting introduction to the so-called Blessing of Jacob, a very ancient piece of poetry, which now claims our attention. The narrative in Genesis in which it is introduced describes the last days of the patriarch. At his death-bed in Goshen he was visited by his son Joseph, who came to see him with his two sons, Manasseh and Ephraim, both born in Egypt. And Jacob said to Joseph, 'Thy two sons, Ephraim and Manasseh . . . are mine; as Reuben and Simeon they shall be to me.' He thus placed them on an equal footing with his own oldest sons. He then desired to bless these adopted children. Now the eyes of Israel were dim for age, and he could but dimly see them. When he had kissed and embraced them, Joseph took them out from between his knees, and, taking Ephraim in his right hand toward Israel's left hand, and Manasseh in his left hand toward Israel's right hand, brought them near to his father. And Israel stretched out his right hand, and laid it upon Ephraim's head, who was the younger, and his left hand upon Manasseh's head, though he was the first-born, and thus blessed them. And Joseph said, 'Not so, my father: for this is the first-born; put thy right hand upon his head.' But Jacob refused, saying,

'I know it, my son, I know it; he also shall become a people, and he also shall be great; but truly his younger brother shall be greater than he.' The dying patriarch then called for all his sons, and said, 'Assemble, that I may tell you what shall befall you in the remotest days.'

It is painful to discover a retrospect with a political tendency in the salient details of a narrative so remarkable for grace and natural feeling. Joseph, whom in the times of the divided Hebrew kingdom two important tribes of the northern division regarded as their ancestor, receives from his dying father a portion above his brethren in the inheritance of the remotest days. The reputed ancestor of the younger of the two tribes, a son of which founded the first dynasty of the northern kingdom, is placed above his older brother, whose descendants played a comparatively brief part in history, in the time of Gideon. It is more painful to discover, with Bernstein, gall and venom in the poetical effusion which is attributed to Jacob as a prophetical parting address to his children. That this address, which opens with objurgations and curses instead of with blessings, and shows paternal warmth only when it touches Joseph, and remains indifferent to Benjamin, that tenderly beloved child of old age, is not a product of the Egyptian period in the history of the Hebrews, but of a time when the tribes of that people were fully established in their own land, requires little critical acumen to

discern. For, as Ewald expresses it,[1] 'it is entirely based on an actual view of the scattered manner in which the twelve tribes dwelt in Canaan.' Its author knew that Zebulun's canton reached the shore of the sea, and bordered on the territory of Zidon; that Issachar's was pleasant, Asher's rich in delicious products, and the land of the sons of Joseph overflowing with abundance. He evidently also knew the story of Samson, as one of the judges of Israel; for what he makes Jacob say of Dan—to use the words of Ewald for what has been remarked by the earliest commentators—'distinctly refers to Samson's time and judicial office, when even the small tribe of Dan was as fortunate as any other great one in seeing, in the person of Samson, a successful judge and hero arise in its midst, of whom it could be proud, and under whom, although small and oppressed, it rose boldly against the Philistine supremacy, like a serpent which, though trodden to the earth, attacks the valiant rider behind.' Ewald, who believes in the historical character of the Danite judge, finds in the circumstance that this position of the tribe soon passed away without abiding consequences a sure indication that the verses referring to the pride of Dan 'must have been written down during Samson's brief and successful resistance.' That Jacob's Blessing was not produced in the time of the kings, is, to him, 'further evident from the fact that the imitation of it, Moses's Blessing, in

[1] 'History of Israel,' vol. i. p. 69.

Deut. xxxiii., was really composed for the purpose of supplying its deficiencies, which were subsequently very sensibly felt. For when Israel felt itself united and happy under kingly rule, then—to say nothing of other changes which time had wrought—it could no longer be contented with a benediction which nowhere regarded the nation as a whole, and which, with respect to some tribes, rather went off into curses, or at any rate into bitter reproaches; and we comprehend how a poet might conceive the idea of remodelling it.' That the story of Samson, overloaded as it is with fabulous features, is too feeble a support for any critical hypothesis needs no elucidation. The argument drawn from a comparison of the two blessings, of their common as well as distinctive features, is, indeed, much stronger; but it breaks down under the difficulty of explaining why in the latter time of the judges, when each tribe lived in independence of all others, and none claimed a hegemony, the tribe of Ephraim, which had repeatedly acted in a wild anti-national spirit—as the stories of Gideon and Jephthah show—should be extolled beyond measure, and Reuben, Simeon, and Levi, for no sin of theirs recorded in the history of the tribes, loaded with ignominy; why a poet of the period of republican equality and anarchy should speak of the sceptre of Judah, and of Joseph as the *nāzīr* among his brethren;[2] and whence the inclination sprang to impute

[2] See below, note 46.

to the legendary ancestor of the oldest tribe a hideous crime, of which the only parallel is found in the history of the house of David. On the other hand, Bernstein's theory of the Jeroboamic origin of the defamatory accounts concerning the ancestors of some of the tribes almost fully explains the various features of Jacob's Blessing. According to it, the Blessing and the libellous fictions are productions of the same time, or the former is the work of a still later age than the latter. That Judah escapes almost unscathed in the Blessing, and his power and leadership are celebrated in it, can partly be explained by the necessity, under which the author labored, of acknowledging patent facts ; for when he wrote, Judah's throne was the equal rival of Ephraim's, and the reign of Solomon had but passed away : Jacob could thus not be made to foretell an ignominious future for his fourth son. But the beginning of the words addressed to Judah must be the insertion of a late redactor, anxious to give its due meed of honor to the tribe which produced the Davidic dynasty, if the whole is really the composition of a zealous Ephraimite. In fact, the words 'thy father's sons bow down before thee' seem to be transferred here from the blessing bestowed upon Joseph, in which they would be at their place before or after the words 'and he was bitterly assailed ; . . .' for Joseph was bitterly assailed by his brethren, as the legend has it, because he dreamed —as they and Jacob himself explained his dreams

of the sheaves and of the eleven stars[3]—of all his father's sons bowing down before him, and the thing really came to pass, when he had become the supreme minister of Pharaoh, and they appeared before him in Egypt. The following sentences in Judah's portion of the Blessing are expressive of power, but also of an abuse of power; of abundance, but also of an abuse of it; of royal rule, but also of its termination. Judah is a lion: he rises from prey; he has vines and wine: he binds his foal to the vine, and his eyes are red with wine;[4] he wields the sceptre and the ruler's staff: only until he comes to Shiloh. This termination of Judah's power at Shiloh has found various explanations; among them is one which, though far from being of recent origin, agrees surprisingly well with Bernstein's theory of the legends with which we are here concerned. The Davidic sceptre, the royal sceptre which ruled united Israel, was broken at the instigation of a prophet of Shiloh, and broken at Shiloh. The first book of Kings[5] tells the story: When Solomon built Millo, and repaired the walls of the city of David, he made the Ephraimite Jeroboam, a

[3] Gen. xxxvii.

[4] That redness of eyes from wine was not considered by the Hebrews a thing to boast of, but to be ashamed of, can clearly be seen from these sentences of the Proverbs (xxiii. 29, 30): 'Who has woe? who has sorrow? who has contentions? who has babbling? who has wounds without cause? who has redness of eyes? They that tarry long at the wine,' etc.

[5] Chapters xi. and xii.

strenuous and industrious man, superintendent of all the service imposed on the house of Joseph. And it came to pass that Jeroboam went out of Jerusalem, and was met on the way by the prophet Ahijah, the Shilonite. The latter had clad himself with a new garment, and they were alone in the field. And Ahijah caught his new garment, rent it in twelve pieces, and said to Jeroboam: 'Take the twelve pieces; for thus says Jehovah, the God of Israel, "Behold, I rend the kingdom out of the hand of Solomon, and give ten tribes to thee, and he shall have one tribe. . . . And thou shalt reign according to all that thy soul desires, and shalt be king over Israel."' Solomon sought therefore to kill Jeroboam, but he fled to Egypt, to King Shishak, and remained there till the end of Solomon's reign. When this king died, his son Rehoboam went to Shechem, where the assembled people were to proclaim him their monarch. But the people had sent for Jeroboam, who now appeared with all the congregation of Israel before Rehoboam, to whom they spoke thus: 'Thy father made our yoke grievous: now, therefore, lighten thou the grievous service of thy father, and the heavy yoke which he put upon us, and we will serve thee.' Rehoboam promised to answer on the third day, when Jeroboam and all the people again came before him. Ill-advised by young courtiers, he gave a fierce answer, and ten tribes immediately revolted, and made Jeroboam their king. And Jeroboam rebuilt Shechem, in the mountains of Ephraim, and made it his

seat. This city had been totally destroyed by Abimelech, Gideon's son, and, since Jeroboam had to rebuild it, it must have been more or less deserted when Rehoboam went there to be inaugurated as king. Now it has been remarked by a sagacious rabbinical commentator of the twelfth century, Samuel ben Meir, that the name Shechem, in connection with Rehoboam, as elsewhere in connection with Joshua, stands exceptionally for Shiloh, which was but a few hours' walk south of it, and that the place intended to be indicated, here and there, was a great national camping-ground between the two towns, generally called after Shiloh. We read in the book of Joshua[6] that, on the conquest of Canaan, 'the whole congregation of the children of Israel assembled at Shiloh, and set up the tabernacle of the congregation there;' that their camp remained 'at Shiloh;'[7] that Joshua, dividing the conquered land between the tribes, 'cast lots for them at Shiloh, before Jehovah;'[8] that when the report came that the tribes of Reuben and Gad and the half-tribe of Manasseh had built an altar east of the Jordan, 'the whole congregation assembled at Shiloh to go to war against them;'[9] and, after all this, that 'Joshua gathered all the tribes of Israel, *to Shechem*,' and that there their elders, chiefs, judges, and officers 'presented themselves *before*

[6] xviii. 1.
[7] xviii. 9.
[8] xviii. 10.
[9] xxii. 12.

God;'[10] that 'Joshua made a covenant with the people that day, and set them a statute and an ordinance *at Shechem*,' and, to commemorate the covenant, 'took a great stone and set it up *there*, under an oak that was *by Jehovah's sanctuary*.'[11] In all this latter narrative Shechem evidently stands for Shiloh, for at Shiloh was 'Jehovah's sanctuary' under Joshua. And at Shiloh 'the house of God' continued to be in the times of the judges.[12] At Shiloh was the national camp during the expedition against Jabesh-in-Gilead,[13] and in those days there was 'a feast of Jehovah at Shiloh yearly.'[14] Samuel's father offered yearly sacrifices 'to Jehovah of hosts at Shiloh;'[15] thither his mother brought him, 'into the house of Jehovah;'[16] there he received his first call as prophet, 'in the temple of Jehovah, where the ark of God was;'[17] and thence the ark was fetched by the people before its capture by the Philistines.[18] There lived the prophet Ahijah, who conspired with Jeroboam for the overthrow of the throne of Solomon, when it had become detestable both to the people and the prophets; and there—that is, at the national camping-

[10] xxiv. 1.
[11] xxiv. 25, 26.
[12] See Judg. xviii. 31.
[13] See Judg. xxi. 12.
[14] Judg. xxi. 19.
[15] I. Sam. i. 3.
[16] I. Sam. i. 24.
[17] I. Sam. iii. 3, 4.
[18] I. Sam. iv. 4.

ground between Shiloh and the then deserted Shechem—the people of Israel assembled when Rehoboam was to be proclaimed king, and, when their demands were treated with scorn, followed the advice of the Shilonite, and revolted, and the sceptre departed from Judah.

The last words of Jacob, as we are told, were these :

(Genesis XLIX.)

(2) Assemble, and listen, sons of Jacob ;
listen to Israel, your father.
Reuben, thou art my first-born,
my marrow, the firstling of my strength :
there was pre-eminence of dignity,
pre-eminence of power—
boiling over as water,[19]
thou shalt not excel ;
for thou ascendedst thy father's bed,[20]
dishonoring him who rested on my couch.[21]
(5) Simeon and Levi are brethren,
their swords[22] are weapons of violence.[23]

[19] Literally, *a boiling over as of water* (thou hast shown).

[20] See Gen. xxxv. 22. In reference to the fact narrated there and the words in the Blessing, I. Chronicles (v. 1) has the following : 'Reuben, the first-born of Israel (for he was the first-born, but as he defiled his father's bed, his birthright was given to the sons of Joseph)' —which is a late echo of the Ephraimitish pretensions.

[21] A euphemistic expression for *dishonoring me.*

[22] *swords*] The rendering of Gesenius, agreeing with Jerome ('arma eorum') and the Midrash, which identifies the word of the text, *m'khērāh*, with the Greek *μάχαιρα*.

[23] Jacob's denunciation is generally regarded to allude to the ruthless destruction of Shechem (Gen. xxxiv.).

In their concert may never be my soul ;
join not their gathering, O my noblest part.
For in their anger they would slay a man,
in their kindness they would hough a bull.
Cursed be their anger—it is fierce ;
their wrath—it is cruel.
I divide them in Jacob,
I scatter them through Israel.[24]
Judah, thee thy brethren extoll ;
thy hand is on the neck of thy foes,[25]
thy father's sons bow down before thee.
Judah is a lion's whelp ;
from prey thou risest, my son.
He stoops, couches, like a lion, or a lioness—
who shall rouse him up ?
(10) The sceptre shall not depart from Judah,
nor the ruler's staff from between his feet,
until he comes to Shiloh,[26]
and there is a gathering[27] of tribes around him.[28]

[24] The Levites had no separate territory allotted to them in Canaan; Simeon, on the southern outskirts of the land, formed but an appendage to Judah, and, excepting the time of the conquest, nowhere figures in history as a tribe. The animosity of the writer against Levi and Simeon is explainable, if he was an Ephraimite, by the circumstance that the bulk of these tribes adhered to Judah, after the disruption of Solomon's kingdom into a northern and a southern state.

[25] In the original the words 'extol thee' (*yōdūkhā*) and 'thy hand' *yād'khā* play upon 'Judah' (*y'hūdāh*).

[26] *to Shiloh*] See note C, at the end of the volume.

[27] *a gathering*] See note D, at the end of the volume.

[28] *around him*] Literally, *to him*, which, however, must not mean *for him, in his favor ;* for ל is, like אֶל, expressive of 'direction and

He binds his foal to the vine,
to a choice plant the colt of his ass;
washes his clothes in wine,
his garment in the blood of grapes;
his eyes are red from wine,
his teeth white with milk.

Zebulun will dwell at the haven of the sea,
and his land[29] be a haven for ships;
his side touches Zidon.

Issachar is a strong-boned ass,
couching between folds.

(15) He saw that rest was good,
that the land was pleasant:
so he bent his shoulder to bear,
and labored, and paid tribute.[30]

Dan shall judge[31] his people,
as one of the tribes of Israel.[32]

motion *toward, to, against;* hence קָרַב with אֶל and לְ, to approach somebody; בּוֹא with אֶל and לְ, Is. lx. 4, 5' (Gesenius, under '*Lāmed*'). Nor is it impossible that the sentence should originally have contained one more word, which was dropped by a redactor: לֹא before לוֹ, or a name (יוֹסֵף?), inconvenient to harmonists, before שִׁילֹה.'

[29] *his land*] Literally, *he*.

[30] Issachar's best possession, the valley of Jezreel, was fertile and exuberant, but unprotected. The tribe was devoted to husbandry and devoid of ambition. It plodded, and paid its taxes, perhaps also ransom to troublesome neighbors, but had the reward (*sākhār*) of its toil. 'Rest,' 'land,' and 'tribute' characterize Issachar's situation in contrast with that of the restless but free seafarer Zebulun.

[31] *Dān*, as a common noun, signifies *judge*.

[32] *Cf.* the quotation from Ewald in reference to Samson, given above.

Dan will be a serpent by the way,
an adder in the path,
which bites the heels of the horse,
so that the rider falls backward—[33]
For thy deliverance I hope, O Jehovah.[34]
Gad—squads invade him,
but he cuts their heels.[35]
(20) Asher's[36] food is fat;
he produces kingly dainties.[37]
Naphtali is a slender hind;
he utters beautiful words.[38]
Joseph is a fruitful young plant,[39]
a fruitful young plant by a well;

[33] The sudden and murderous attacks of Samson on the Philistines are probably alluded to here.

[34] The tribe of Dan, in its exposed position and frequent struggles with the Philistines, was often in need of deliverance

[35] The combination of *squad*, (*in*)*vade*, *cut*, with *Gad* is intentional, in imitation of the plays upon words in the original.

[36] The ב prefixed to 'Asher' in the Hebrew is considered by Teller, Bleek, Knobel, Luzzatto, and others as belonging to the immediately preceding 'āqēb, which is thus changed into 'ăqēbām, *their* heel.

[37] Asher is connected with *ōsher*, felicity, in Gen. xxx. 13.

[38] These verses probably contain allusions to the Naphtalite Barak (Levi ben Gershon)—the name of that commander signifying *lightning*—and to the thousands of Naphtalites who with him rushed to arms against Sisera, and after the victory sang Deborah's beautiful song (Rashi)—warriors as swift in battle 'as the roes upon the mountains' (I. Chron. xii. 8), and equally swift to bring the tidings of victory (Samuel ben Meir).

[39] Or, *the young shoot of a fruitful plant* (Gesenius, Ewald, Knobel). In *pōrāth*, fruitful, or fruitful plant, is an allusion to Ephraim; the word is obviously repeated for effect.

the branches run over the wall.
He was bitterly assailed, and shot at,
and hated, by archers ;[40]
but his bow abode in strength,
and his arms[41] were supple—
through the hands of Jacob's defender,
through him, the shepherd and rock of Israel ;[42]
(25) through thy father's God—he helps thee ;
through the Almighty—he blesses thee,
with blessings of heaven above,
blessings of the deep spread out below,
blessings of breast and womb.[43]

[40] Ephraim's frequent contests with other tribes and neighboring countries are here referred to. The house of Joseph is represented as innocently assailed, a target to the hatred of envious brothers. Yet the conflicts were often provoked by Ephraim's arrogance and ambition.

[41] *his arms*] Literally, *the arms of his hands.*

[42] According to an emendation of the text proposed by Kohler (' Der Segen Jacob's,' p. 80), which substitutes מִזְּרֹעֵי for מִשָּׁם רֹעֶה, the verse is to be translated : *through the arms of the rock of Israel.* מֵאֶזְרֹעֵי, which covers all the letters, seems preferable.

[43] '*I.e.*, blessings of fruitfulness in every quarter—on the soil through rain and dew and springs of water, and on animal nature, both man and beast. All this lies concentrated in the words of these three little lines. Equally pregnant with blessing is the whole speech.' (Ewald.) The extraordinary partiality of the writer for the house of Joseph is unmistakable. The words *shādayim vārā'ham,* breast and womb, may be a corruption of *shemesh vīrā'hīm,* sun and moons, or sun and months, the corresponding words of the Blessing of Moses (Deut. xxxiii. 14), although there separated.

Thy father's blessings[44] go beyond
the blessings of my progenitors,
to[45] the utmost bound of the everlasting hills ;
they shall rest on the head of Joseph,
on the head of the crowned one[46] among his
brethren.
Benjamin is a wolf that tears ;
he devours prey in the morning,
divides spoils in the evening.[47]

[44] *Thy father's blessings*] The blessings which thy father bestows upon thee.

[45] *my progenitors, to*] The rendering of *hōray 'ad* in the Masoretic text. But the translation of these words in the Septuagint (ὀρέων μονίμων), the parallelism of 'everlasting hills,' the corresponding sentence in the Blessing of Moses (Deut. xxxiii. 15), which speaks of 'primeval mountains' and 'everlasting hills,' and the analogous connection in Hab. iii. 6 of 'eternal mountains' and 'everlasting hills' have led J. D. Michaelis, Gesenius, Bohlen, Tuch, and others to read instead of *hōray 'ad*, in the sentence before us, *hārē 'ad, harrē 'ad*, or *hōrē 'ad*, all of which phrases mean *the eternal mountains*. According to this emendation, the translation of the sentence is : Thy father's blessings go beyond the blessings of the eternal mountains, (beyond) the utmost bound of the everlasting hills.

[46] *the crowned one*] Thus Aben Ezra, Samuel ben Meir, Ewald, and others render here the word *nāzīr*, comparing *nezer*, crown ; Gesenius renders it *the prince ;* others have *the chosen one, the distinguished one*, or *the sacredly devoted one*. Joseph attained princely dignity in Egypt ; Jeroboam, of the house of Joseph, founded a royal dynasty.

[47] Praise and blame are here mixed together, as in the words addressed to Judah. Both bravery and wantonness mark the history of the tribe. It occupied a middle ground, geographically and politically, between Ephraim and Judah.

VI.

The psalm (cv.) given above speaks of Israel's coming to Egypt, of the increase of the people there, of the plots against it, of the signs and portents shown by Moses and Aaron in furtherance of its deliverance, of the plagues with which the Egyptian tyrant and his nation were smitten, of the triumphant exodus of the Israelites from the land of bondage, and their miraculous preservation in the wilderness, through which they were guided to Canaan, the land of promise. The Pentateuch details the marvellous events to which the psalm briefly alludes, and stories of which were among the national traditions of Israel long before the composition of this and similar poetical summaries, or of the books in which the fuller prose narratives appear. The prophets of the eighth century before the Christian era distinctly refer to the principal features of what was considered the birth of Israel as a nation. Amos says in the name of God, 'I brought you up from the land of Egypt, and led you through the wilderness, forty years, to take possession of the Amorite's land.' [1] Hosea speaks of the nation's day of birth, when Israel was a naked child, exposed in the wilderness; of God's love to him when he was young, and was called out of Egypt as a son;

[1] Am. ii. 10.

and of the prophet through whom God brought him up from Egypt, and who watched him.[2] Isaiah knows of the road across the tongue of the sea of Egypt by which Israel marched, on leaving that country.[3] Micah mentions Moses, Aaron, and Miriam, Balak and Balaam.[4] All speak of the deliverance from Egyptian bondage as of a fact well known to their hearers, and doubted by none of them. It is probable that the belief in it was general in the nation some centuries before the eighth. A few short fragments incorporated in the Pentateuch, which have the appearance of great antiquity,[5] tend to confirm this view, and the song in Exodus xv., which celebrates the miraculous crossing of the Red Sea, is also considered by some as much older than the oldest extant prophetical writings.

This unanimity of ancient Hebrew tradition has led almost all writers of Israelitish history, including the latest, to enter in their pages the Egyptian bondage of the people, its deliverance by a more or less astounding event, and the deliverer Moses, as indubitably historical. Of course, by the dissecting knife of criticism almost every single event narrated in connection with that deliverance is mercilessly cut up, and of the whole only a loose, shadowy tissue is left; but this covers, at least, the blank

[2] Hos. ii. 5 (3); xi. 1; xii. 14 (13).

[3] Is. xi. 15, 16.

[4] Mic. vi. 4, 5.

[5] These fragments refer to the Israelites in the wilderness; they will be spoken of further on.

with which the history of the Hebrew nation would otherwise begin. A small Semite tribe, kindred to the Edomites, Moabites, Ishmaelites, and other inhabitants of northern Arabia, having migrated as far as Goshen, east of the Delta of Egypt, there became subject to the Pharaohs, grew up to larger proportions, was cruelly oppressed, but was delivered and led into Arabia by a great man, Moses, who baffled the pursuit of the enemy in the vicinity of the Red Sea, gave his people laws in the neighborhood of Mount Sinai, and led it to the border of Canaan, which it conquered after his death—this is what Ewald, Hitzig, Graetz, Kuenen, Oort, Duncker, Maspero, and other writers on the subject agree in accepting as true, but this is almost all. When and whence the Hebrews came to Egypt; whether during or after the reign of the Shepherds in the lower Nile valley; whether from Canaan or from Arabia; whether they remained there four hundred and thirty years, as is stated in Exodus xii.,[6] or only to the fourth generation, as is indicated elsewhere in the Pentateuch;[7] what their number may have been at the exodus—for the Biblical statement that they numbered six hundred thousand fighting men is generally rejected by writers; whether they left Egypt four hundred and eighty years before the building of Solomon's temple, as I. Kings[8] has it

[6] V. 40.

[7] Compare Ex. vi. 16–20 with Gen. xv. 16.

[8] vi. 1.

—that is a few years after 1500 B.C.—or nearly two centuries later, shortly after the reign of Ramses II., which agrees better with Egyptian history; how much truth, if any, may lie at the bottom of the absurd story of the expulsion of the Hebrews told by the Egyptian priest Manetho in the third century B.C., and preserved by Josephus;[9] whether the wanderings in the wilderness actually lasted forty years, as the Bible tells us, or only four years or less, as a close scrutiny of the Biblical data themselves seems to prove—these and many minor questions are variously answered by critical inquirers.

Nor is the little that is accepted laid before the readers with the same assurance by different critics. About Moses, for instance, we read the following in Ewald:[10] 'Now it certainly appears on careful examination that Moses is seldom expressly mentioned in the common life of the people during the centuries immediately before and after David. . . . The first passage of the prophets in which Moses, though not named, is alluded to as the "prophet" of ancient times, and is associated with Jacob, is in Hosea;[11] the first where he is named with Aaron and Miriam, is in Micah.[12] There, however, the remembrance of these three personages, as is seen from the immediately following mention of Balaam (v. 5)

[9] 'Against Apion,' i. 26.

[10] 'History of Israel,' vol. ii. p. 31.

[11] xii. 14 (13) *et seq.*

[12] vi. 4.

in agreement with the present narrative in Numbers xxii.–xxiv., is revived rather in a learned fashion from books. . . . But any one in our day who should conclude from this that perhaps Moses never existed, or never achieved any thing great, would only prove himself both thoughtless and ignorant, and his opinion would not be bold, but presumptuous and wrong.' What made Ewald so positive, was *his* 'examination of the original authorities' and 'other trustworthy signs.' Kuenen, who has examined authorities and signs in a different way, propounds his conclusions in a more moderate tone :[13] 'Towards the end of the fourteenth century B.C., the sons of Israel, and with them most of the Hebrews, escaped from the Egyptian oppression, under which they had groaned during the reigns of Ramses II. and his successor Menephta, and left the land of Goshen. . . . In the narratives relating to the exodus *Moses* plays a very important part. He appears there as the deliverer of the sons of Israel, but at the same time as the reformer of their religion and as their lawgiver; he opens an entirely new epoch in the religious development of his nation. Is tradition worthy of credit upon this point? Some have gone so far as to throw doubt upon the very existence of Moses; others have denied that we are entitled any longer to regard him as Israel's lawgiver. This latter assertion especially

[13] 'The Religion of Israel,' vol. i. p. 272 *et seq.*

deserves serious consideration. It is quite certain that nearly all the laws of the Pentateuch date from much later times: if no difficulty was experienced in ascribing to him these more recent ordinances, what guarantee have we that he promulgated any one of the laws? Probably not one of the psalms is from David's hand; yet in the titles he is named as the author of more than seventy of these songs, and at a later period even the whole of them were attributed to him. It cannot be proved that a single one of the "proverbs of Solomon" proceeds from the king in whose name they all stand. Cannot this be the case also with Moses? Is not the silence of the older prophets as to the *Mosaic* law—Malachi is the first who mentions it—a real obstacle to the supposition that even a very small portion of it originated with him? These reflections and questions are not without foundation. But the very examples by which they are enforced can teach us how far doubt is legitimate, and what limits it may not overpass. . . .' 'There is no well-founded doubt,' says Ewald,[14] 'that the Ten Commandments are derived from Moses, in their general import, their present order, and even in their peculiar language.' Differently Kuenen:[15] 'Reserving our right to subject each separate commandment to special criticism and, if necessary,

[14] 'History of Israel,' vol. ii. p. 18.

[15] 'The Religion of Israel,' vol. i. p. 285.

to deny its Mosaic origin, we acknowledge it as a fact, that Moses, in the name of Yahveh, prescribed to the Israelitish tribes *such a law* as is contained in "the ten words." ' Duncker[16] believes the Mosaic origin of the Decalogue to be sufficiently proved, 'though it is not before us in its primitive wording.' Maspero[17] doubts 'whether there ever was in reality a Mosaic legislation,' though he believes in Moses as 'the organizer of the Hebrew nation.' Graf[18] shares the doubt. Nöldeke[19] considers the supposition that Moses was the author of the Ten Commandments, even in their most rudimentary form, as 'very questionable.'

Seinecke[20] can discover 'nothing' positive about Moses. 'The law is not from him, not a single line of it. The forty years' sojourn of Israel in the wilderness, as it appears in the Torah, is unhistorical.' He doubts whether the Hebrews ever lived on Egyptian territory, as the Septuagint regards Goshen as a part of Arabia.

What renders so much skepticism little surprising is, more than any thing else perhaps, the lack of evidence from Egyptian sources corroborative of the Hebrew traditions. Writing in 1842, Ewald[21] had

[16] 'Geschichte des Alterthums,' vol. i. p. 422 (5th ed.).

[17] 'Histoire ancienne des peuples de l'Orient,' p. 291.

[18] 'Die geschichtlichen Bücher des Alten Testaments,' p. 28.

[19] 'Untersuchungen zur Kritik des Alten Testaments,' p. 51.

[20] 'Geschichte des Volkes Israel,' vol. i. p. 189.

[21] 'History of Israel,' vol. i. p. 388.

to express his regret that 'the labors of modern scholars in deciphering Egyptian inscriptions have not been rewarded as yet by much reliable information with respect to this particular portion of early history,' but he consoled himself with the thought that the number of monuments to be examined was 'constantly receiving accessions,' and that at that very time fresh discoveries were 'again looked for.' In a note added in 1864 he referred to more recent research, but to no results, and expressed his belief that from the investigations and excavations of Mariette and others 'much new light may be expected.' In 1868 Kuenen[22] spoke of the light from the Egyptian monuments as still to come from new decipherments. In 1875 Ebers,[23] after long and arduous studies in this field, declared that 'the monuments say nothing about the exodus.' In 1876 Brugsch,[24] and after him Poole[25] and Duncker,[26] abandoned the formerly attempted identification of the Apuriu of the Egyptian records with the Hebrews. Lauth's identification of Moses[27] with a pedantic Egyptian scribe of the name of Messu,

[22] 'The Religion of Israel,' vol. i. p. 122.

[23] Art. 'Egypten' in Riehm's 'Handwörterbuch des Biblischen Alterthums,' p. 333.

[24] 'Geschichte Aegyptens,' p. 541, and p. 582; *cf.* p. 550.

[25] Art. 'Egypt,' in the 'Encyclopædia Britannica,' ninth ed., vol. vii. p. 741.

[26] 'Geschichte des Alterthums,' vol. i. p. 386 *et seq.*

[27] In 'Moses der Hebraeer.'

extensively spoken of in a papyrus, may now be said to belong to the rubbish of Egyptology. In a word, about the Hebrews in Egypt, from Abraham down to Moses—to state it with Brugsch—'there is not a syllable in the inscriptions.' All that has been gained from decipherings in favor of the Hebrew narratives is that the Egyptian coloring of the latter is excellent; that is, that the writers of them knew Egypt and the Egyptians well. The unanimity of Hebrew tradition, on one side, and the silence of the monuments, on the other, will justify a great deal of belief as well as of doubt.

The song on the crossing of the Red Sea, which is attributed to Moses—according to some critics, by a different writer to Miriam[28]—has clearly the appearance of having been elaborated after the story which precedes it, rather than of having influenced the composition of the latter. When the story, in its earliest form, was first written down, there is no indication to base a conjecture upon. Of the song, parts sound like the historico-religious verses of a very late age; others have the ring of great antiquity; several lines allude to the temple. The story runs thus:

When the king of Egypt was told that the people of Israel had fled, he took six hundred chosen chariots, and all the chariots of his land, and

[28] That writer's statement is supposed to be preserved in Ex. xv. 21, which is to be compared with the opening of the song.

started in pursuit of the fugitives. He overtook them encamping by the sea. When the Egyptians drew nigh, the children of Israel cried out to Jehovah, and reproachfully asked Moses why he had led them out of Egypt to die in the wilderness. Moses tried to calm them with the promise of divine deliverance. And Jehovah said to him, 'Speak to the children of Israel, that they go forward; and thou lift up thy staff, and stretch out thy hand over the sea, and divide it: the children of Israel shall go through it on dry ground.' Now the angel of God, who went before the camp of Israel, and the pillar of cloud, removed and went behind them; and thus there was darkness to the Egyptian camp, and light to that of Israel, so that one came not near the other all the night. And Moses stretched out his hand over the sea; and Jehovah caused the sea to go back by a strong east wind all that night, and made the sea dry, and the waters were divided. And the children of Israel went into the midst of the sea on dry ground, and the waters were a wall to them on their right and on their left. The Egyptians pursued, and went in after them into the midst of the sea, horses, chariots, and horsemen. In the morning watch Jehovah looked to the host of the Egyptians through the pillar of fire and cloud, and confused them, and took off their chariot wheels, and made their march slow. They would now turn to flee, but Jehovah said to Moses, 'Stretch out thy hand over the sea, that the waters may come again

upon the Egyptians, their chariots, and horsemen.' Moses did so, and the sea returned when the morning appeared, the Egyptians fleeing against it; and it covered them all, chariots, horsemen, and all the host of Pharaoh: not one remained. But the children of Israel crossed on dry land, and, looking back, saw the Egyptians dead on the sea shore. Then sang Moses and the children of Israel the song of triumph to Jehovah; Miriam, the prophetess, the sister of Aaron and Moses, and all the women accompanying the singing with timbrels and dances.

'It is quite possible,' says Oort,[29] 'that the stories of the passage of the Red Sea preserve the memory of the Israelites having taken advantage of the ebb to cross a ford of the sea, and having thus escaped, while the Egyptians were surprised by the flood as they hurried in pursuit of them.' 'But,' he adds, reproducing with alterations an argument of Reimarus,[30] 'the whole of this history becomes unintelligible if we believe the statement that the sons of Israel numbered six hundred thousand men, when they left Egypt. For, if we add to these, not only the women and children, but the "mixed multitude," as it is called, which was thought to be sufficiently numerous to be mentioned separately, we shall reach a figure of about three millions. If this were so, it would not only be impossible to conceive

[29] 'The Bible for Young People,' part i. book ii. ch. v.

[30] In the so-called 'Wolfenbüttelsche Fragmente,' published by Lessing.

of the whole people getting into order for their journey in one night, but even of their being oppressed in the manner stated in Exodus, or crossing the sea in a single night. To form some idea of all that would have been involved in this, we have only to remember that in 1812, when Napoleon crossed the river Niemen, it took his army of about two hundred and thirty thousand men three days and nights to cross the river by three bridges in close file. If we bear in mind that the Israelites would have about three times as many fighting men, encumbered, too, with all those women, children, and flocks, the impossibility of what we are told becomes obvious. In the same manner it is easy to say, "And Moses said to the Israelites, rise up!" but where no telegraph was available, it would take one or two days for an order to break up to reach the furthest quarter of a camp in which there were about three million people.'

The story, however, as given in Exodus, means to tell miracles, and such are celebrated in the song, which follows here—a song forcible and chaste, and worthy of a grand event:

(Exodus XV.)

(1) I sing to Jehovah,
for he is grandly triumphant:
horse and rider
he has dashed into the sea.

Yah[31] is my triumph, my song ;
he has become my deliverance.
Here is my God—him I glorify ;
my father's God—I extol him.
Jehovah is a warrior,
Jehovah[32] is his name.
Pharaoh's chariots and host
he has hurled into the sea ;
his choicest knights
have sunk into the Sea of Weeds ;[33]
(5) floods cover them,
they sank into the deeps as a stone.
Thy right hand, O Jehovah,
shines with strength ;
thy right hand, O Jehovah,
crushes the foe.
In the height of thy greatness[34]
thou destroyest thy enemies ;
thou sendest thy wrath,
and it consumes them as stubble.
At a breath from thy nostrils
the waters rose in piles,
waves stood like dikes,
the depths congealed
in the heart of the sea.

[31] See above, II., note 16.

[32] In the original, *yhvh* (with the vowel-points of *ădōnāy*, Lord) that is, probably, *yahveh*.

[33] The Hebrew name of the Red Sea.

[34] Literally, rather, *in the greatness of thy eminence.*

The foe said,
'I will pursue, overtake,
divide the booty—
they shall satiate my desire ;
I draw my sword,
my hand destroys them.'
(10) Thou madest thy wind blow,
and the sea covered them ;
they sank as lead
into the mighty floods.
Who is like thee among the gods, O Jehovah ?
who like thee resplendent in holiness,
sung with awe in hymns,
a worker of wonders ?
Thou stretchedst out thy right hand,
and the earth swallowed them.
Thou ledst in thy mercy
the people redeemed by thee ;
thou guidedst it triumphantly
to thy holy abode.
The nations heard, and trembled ;
a quiver seized on the dwellers in Philistia,
(15) Edom's princes were amazed,
of Moab's mighty men a tremor took hold,
all the inhabitants of Canaan were undone.
Fear and dread befell them,
at the grand appearance of thy arm
they were still as a stone—
while thy people marched on, O Jehovah,
the people thou hadst made thy own.

Thou carriedst them, and plantedst them
on the hill of thy possession ;
on the spot formed, O Jehovah, into a seat for thee,
the sanctuary, O Lord, established by thy hands.—
Jehovah will reign for ever and ever.

VII.

The wanderings of Israel in the wilderness are mainly the theme of Psalm cvi. This completely agrees in character with Psalm cv., given above,[1] and is perhaps the work of the same author. It can thus be given here without special introductory remarks :

(Psalm CVI.)

(1) Praise ye Yah.
Give ye thanks to Jehovah, for he is kind ;
for his mercy is for ever.
Who shall speak Jehovah's mighty deeds,
proclaim all his glory ?
Happy they who observe justice,
he who deals righteously at all times !
Remember me, O Jehovah, in thy kindness to thy people,
notice me in bringing thy deliverance ;
(5) that I may see the welfare of thy chosen ones,
may rejoice in thy nation's gladness,
and glory with thy possession.
We have sinned, with our fathers ;
We have acted perversely, wickedly.
Our fathers in Egypt considered not thy wonders,
remembered not thy many mercies,
and rebelled at the very sea, at the Sea of Weeds.[2]

[1] II.

[2] Red Sea.

But he saved them for the sake of his name,
to make known his power.
He rebuked the Sea of Weeds, and it dried up ;
and he led them through the deeps, as through a desert.
He saved them from the hater's hand,
delivered them from the hand of the foe.
The waters covered their enemies,
not one of them was left.
Then they believed his words,
and sang his praise.
They soon forgot his deeds,
and waited not for his counsel.
They conceived a lust in the wilderness,
tempted God in the desert ;
he gave them what they desired,
but sent leanness into their lives.
They showed envy of Moses in the camp ;
of Aaron, Jehovah's saint ;
and the earth, opening, swallowed up Dathan,
and covered the company of Abiram ;[3]
a fire broke out in their gathering,
a flame consumed the wicked.
They made a calf in Horeb,
and worshipped a molten image,
exchanging their glory
for the likeness of an ox, that eats grass.
They forgot God, their deliverer,

[3] Dathan and Abiram rose with Korah against the leadership of Moses and Aaron ; see Num. xvi.

who did great things in Egypt,
wondrous things in the land of Ham,[4]
portentous things by the Sea of Weeds.
So he purposed to destroy them ;
but Moses, his chosen one, stood in the breach before him,
to turn back his wrath from destroying.
They spurned the pleasant land,
believed not his word ;
(25) and murmured in their tents,
and hearkened not to Jehovah's voice.
So he lifted up his hand against them,
to overthrow them in the wilderness,
to overthrow their offspring among the nations,
and to scatter them over the lands.
They attached themselves to Baal-Peor,[5]
and ate the sacrifices of the dead.[6]
They mortified him by their doings,
and a plague broke in upon them ;
(30) but Phinehas stood up, and pleaded,
and the plague was stayed ;
this was reckoned to him a righteous deed,
for all generations, for evermore.
They incensed him at the waters of Meribah,[7]

[4] See above, II., note 10.

[5] A Baal of Moab, worshipped on Mount Peor with lascivious rites. Whether the god was named from the mountain, or the mountain from the god, may be doubted.

[6] *the dead*] Lifeless idols.

[7] See Num. xx.

and Moses suffered on their account ;
for they provoked his spirit,
and his lips talked hastily.
They destroyed not the peoples
about whom Jehovah spoke to them ;
(35) but mingled among the nations,
and learned their doings ;
worshipped their idols,
which became a snare to them ;
sacrificed their sons and daughters to demons,
shedding innocent blood—
the blood of their sons and daughters,
whom they sacrificed to the idols of Canaan—
and the land was polluted with bloodshed.
They were defiled with their works,
with doings like a harlot's.
(40) So Jehovah's anger was kindled against his people,
he abhorred his possession.
He delivered them into the hand of the nations,
haters became their rulers ;
their foes oppressed them,
they bent under their hand.
Many times he rescued them,
but they framed rebellious devices,
and were bowed down for their iniquity.
Yet he looked at their distress,
when he heard their cry ;
(45) and he remembered for them his covenant,
and relaxed, in[8] his fulness of mercies ;

[8] *in*] Literally, *according to.*

and procured them compassion
from all their captors.

Save us, O Jehovah, our God,
and gather us from among the nations ;
that we may give thanks to thy holy name,
and triumph in thy glory.

The last verse of the psalm, which is here omitted, does not form an integral part of it, excepting, perhaps, the word *hall'lūyāh.*[9] It is an insertion by the collector, marking the end of Book IV. Similar, partly identical, pious sentences, marking division, are inserted at the conclusion of Books I., II., and III.[10]

[9] *Cf.* the conclusion of Ps. cv.

[10] Pss. xli , lxxii., lxxxix.

VIII.

While the Israelites were wandering from the Red Sea toward Mount Sinai, they were attacked—Exodus xvii. contains the story—by the Amalekites, a roving robber tribe of the desert. Moses directed Joshua to fight them with picked men, and himself, with Aaron and Hur, ascended the top of a hill, holding God's staff in his hand. And as long as Moses held up his hand, Israel prevailed ; but when he let it down, for his hands were heavy, Amalek prevailed. So they seated him on a stone, and Aaron and Hur stayed up his hands till sunset. And Amalek was defeated with the edge of the sword. Then Jehovah said to Moses, ' Write this for a memorial in a book, and rehearse it in Joshua's ears ; for I will utterly wipe out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven.' And Moses built an altar, and named it God-my-Banner. He said :

(Exodus XVII. 15.)

' Lo, the hand upon Yah's throne :
Jehovah wars against Amalek
from age to age.'

These three short lines are probably a fragment, perhaps the concluding part, of a poem which sang Israel's struggles with Amalek. It may have been composed during Saul's war with that tribe, of which

there is also a poetical reminiscence ;[1] possibly it formed a part of the lost 'Book of the Wars of Jehovah.'[2] The first line is generally explained as expressing an oath, God swearing by his own throne. Aben Ezra and Samuel ben Meir point to this parallel in Deuteronomy :[3] 'I lift up my hand to heaven, and say, "As I live for ever. . . ." The word *kēs* in the original, which is rendered *throne*, and occurs nowhere else, is regarded as an archaic form of *kissē*, and thus as a proof of the great antiquity of the fragment ; but many critics consider it to have been substituted by mistake for *nēs*,[4] banner, the very word contained in the name given by Moses to the altar.[5]

[1] I. Sam. xv. 33.

[2] Of which below.

[3] xxxii. 40.

[4] כס for נס in Hebrew.

[5] If this supposition be correct, the mistake is a very ancient one, since the Samaritan code has *kissē*. The Septuagint had a strangely corrupted text before it.

IX.

The tenth chapter of Numbers describes the order in which the Israelites marched, after leaving the wilderness of Sinai. The ark of the covenant of Jehovah went before them, to search out resting places for them. And when the ark set forward, Moses said:

(Numbers X. 35.)

'Rise, O Jehovah, and let thy foes be scattered,
and all who hate thee flee before thee.'

And when it rested, he said:

(X. 36.)

'Return, O Jehovah, to the myriads of Israel's
thousands.'

These poetical lines were probably taken by the writer of this portion of Numbers from some earlier document, referring to the wars of Israel. Possibly they formed standing invocations at the setting out and returning of the ark in the times when it was customary to march under its protection to battle, of which we have examples in the history of Eli[1] and of David.[2] They are also contained, though with some

[1] I. Sam. iv.
[2] II. Sam. xi. 11.

alterations, in Psalm lxviii.,[3] a hymn so curiously composed that it is considered by some eminent critics as one of the oldest extant Hebrew poems, from which other old songs largely borrowed, while equally good authorities find in it a very late imitation of archaic poetry, abounding in copied lines. It is not at all likely that the writer in Numbers copied the words before us from the psalm, for he was not in need of poetical strains ; the psalmist may have taken his from Numbers, or from a source open to both writers.

[3] Verses 2 (1) and 18 (17) ; the latter verse must be compared in the original.

X.

At the close of their wandering through the wilderness, the Israelites, as we read in the book of Numbers, pitched their tents in the valley of the Zared.[1] Removing thence, they encamped on the side of the Arnon,[2] a river of the wilderness, 'which comes out of the territory of the Amorites; for the Arnon was the border of Moab, between Moab and the Amorites.' Apparently in confirmation of this geographical statement, the narrative quotes a few poetical lines from a 'book of the wars of Jehovah,' of which there is no other mention in the Bible. The quotation is evidently the fragment of a strophe, torn from the context, and lacks the complement of a verb, which probably referred to capture or passage.[3] The wording is very concise, and unmistakably archaic. The quotation may be translated thus:

[1] A south-eastern affluent of the Dead Sea, according to Robinson, Wetzstein, and Palmer; according to Knobel, a principal branch of the Arnon.

[2] An affluent of the Dead Sea, which it enters about the middle of its east shore: the present Wady Mojib or Mujeb. In the passage before us one of its upper branches is probably meant.

[3] Capture by the Israelites or by the Amorites (see below), or passage by the former. Graetz ('Geschichte der Juden,' vol. i. p. 56) presumes the expression 'we passed by' to be wanting, and the sentence to refer to localities which the Israelites were not permitted to attack.

(Numbers XXI. 14, 15.)

Vaheb in Suphah,[4]
and the streams[5] of Arnon,
and the slope of the streams,
which sinks toward the seat of Ar,[6]
and leans on the border of Moab.

The narrative—or the continuation of the words quoted[7]—proceeds to tell the further march: Thence to Beer, that is the well[8] concerning which Jehovah said to Moses, 'Gather the people together, and I will give them water.' Then Israel sang this song:

[4] *Vaheb . . . Suphah*] Presumably names of a place and a region. There is a number of other explanations of the Hebrew text, some of them based on readings differing from the Masoretic. The rendering of the English Authorized Version, which proceeds from the assumptions that *vāhēb* stands for *yāhēb*, he gave, he did, and that *sūphāh* is a form of *sūph*, and this an elliptical expression for *yam sūph*, the Sea of Weeds, is now generally regarded as untenable. Gesenius, Luzzatto, and others regard *sūphāh* as a common noun, and, taking it in the sense in which it occurs elsewhere, translate *Vaheb in a whirlwind* (*God reduced*).

[5] *the streams*] Probably the upper branches.

[6] The ancient capital of Moab, also called Ar-Moab, and the City (*'īr*) of Moab, *'ār* in Moabitish probably signifying the same as *'īr* in Hebrew. It lay south of the junction of the Wady Enkeileh with the Arnon or Mojib.

[7] This view is held by many expounders; the poetical quotation, according to it, extends from verse 14 to the end of v. 20, including the stations named in v. 19, which are here omitted.

[8] *Beer* (*b'ēr*) signifies (a) *well*.

(XXI. 17, 18.)

Spring up, O well—
Sing ye to it—
O well, which princes dug,
the nobles of the nation hollowed,
with sceptre and staff.[9]

This Beer is probably identical with the Beer-Elim (Well of the Mighty) of Isaiah's prophecy against Moab,[10] and it has been presumed [11] that the song refers to a well of uncommon size and magnificence, built by the rulers of Moab for their people, and unexpectedly beheld by the Israelites emerging from the desert. Graetz[12] sees in the solemn digging of the well—by the leaders of Israel—a national act of taking possession. The song is smoother than the preceding quotation, but there is nothing in it militating against the supposition that it, too, is taken from the 'Book of the Wars of Jehovah,' a supposition the more natural as the immediately following enumeration of camping places embraces a passage similar in character to that credited to the war-book, without an indication of the source. It is this :

[9] 'The statement must not be stretched so as to mean that the princes used their staffs of dignity as digging tools ; they only appeared with them, and with them gave the directions for digging' (Knobel).

[10] Is. xv. 8.

[11] By Kennicott and others.

[12] 'Geschichte der Juden,' *l. c.*

(XXI. 20.)

From Bamoth[13] in the valley,
which is in Moab's field,
to Pisgah's[14] summit,
which looks out upon the desert.

We now read of the beginning of the conquest of what was afterward Transjordanic Palestine. The conflict arose thus: Israel sent messengers to Sihon, King of the Amorites, asking permission to cross his territory by the royal highway, and promising the strictest observance of order. But Sihon refused to comply with the request, and, gathering his forces, marched out to meet Israel on the border of the wilderness. He fought a battle at Jahaz,[15] and was totally defeated; and Israel occupied his land, from

[13] Fully Bamoth-Baal (Heights of Baal), a town of Moab, subsequently allotted to Reuben, north of the Arnon, supposed to have been situated on Jebel Attarus (Knobel, Mühlau in Riehm's Bible Dictionary). The place 'cannot be identified with any degree of certainty' (Palmer, 'The Desert of the Exodus,' ch. xxiv.).

[14] A ridge or mountain east of the mouth of the Jordan in the Dead Sea, of which Mt. Nebo is mentioned as the summit, or one of the peaks (Deut. xxxiv. 1). Prof. J. A. Paine, of the American Palestine Exploration Society, who in 1873 ascended several heights in that region, identifies Pisgah with Jebel Siagah, a triple summit 2360 ft. high, a mile and a quarter south-west of Jebel Neba or Nebbeh; the latter, in which he, with De Saulcy and the Duke De Luynes, recognizes Nebo, is a short round summit some three hundred feet higher, and about five miles south-west of Heshbon.

[15] Jahaz or Jahzah, a Moabitish town, south of Medeba (according to Jerome and Eusebius), and presumably north of the Arnon.

the Arnon to the Jabbok,[16] taking possession of all the cities of the Amorites, including Heshbon.[17] For Heshbon was then the city of Sihon, the Amorite king, who had fought against the former king of Moab, and conquered all his land to the Arnon. About these events the narrative quotes the following poem, probably also extracted from the 'Book of the Wars of Jehovah':

(XXI. 27–30.)

Come ye into Heshbon:
let Sihon's city be built and erected.
Lo, a fire has sprung from Heshbon,
a flame from Sihon's capital;
it has consumed Moab's Ar,
the lords of Arnon-Heights.[18]
Woe to thee, Moab;
thou art lost, Chemosh's[19] people—

[16] The present Nahr ez-Zerka (Blue River), a stream traversing the ancient Gilead in a westerly direction, and emptying into the Jordan nearly opposite Nablus.

[17] A town of which extensive and magnificent ruins, belonging to various periods, are still known under the name of Hesban; they lie about eighteen miles due east of the northern extremity of the Dead Sea.

[18] Probably the hills on the river in the vicinity of the capital.

[19] The national god of the Moabites, identical with the Moloch of the Ammonites, and worshipped with human sacrifices. The inscription of King Mesha (the Moabite stone) again and again mentions his name.

he has rendered his sons fugitives,[20]
and his daughters captives
of the Amorite king, Sihon.
And we triumphed :[21]
Heshbon is destroyed, as far as Dibon ;[22]
we have wasted as far as Nophah,[23]
which extends to Medeba.[24]

The first six lines seem to express the exultation of the Amorites, who, after their victory over the Moabites, flocked to Sihon's capital ; while the following are a satirical utterance of compassion for Moab by the Hebrew poet, who then proceeds to

[20] *he has rendered his sons fugitives*] The first pronoun refers to Chemosh ; the second was understood by Jeremiah, who reproduced this passage (Jer. xlviii. 46), to refer to Moab. The prophet's words are : 'Woe to thee, Moab ; Chemosh's people is lost ; for thy sons have been taken into captivity,' etc.

[21] *and we triumphed*] This (after Knobel) is one of the many conjectural translations of the Hebrew *vannīrām*, several of which are, perhaps, equally plausible.

[22] A royal city of Moab, the ruins of which, about three miles north of the Arnon, are still called Diban. So far south all that belonged to Heshbon was destroyed.

[23] Nophah is mentioned nowhere else, unless it be identical with Nobah (Judg. viii. 11).

[24] *which extends to Medeba*] The translation of *ăsher 'ad mēd'bā* in the Masoretic text. The *r* in *ăsher*, however, is marked by the Masoretes with a circle over it as suspicious, and the Septuagint and the Samaritan version had *ēsh*, fire, instead of *ăsher*, which, before them. The original meaning of the line may thus have been, *fire as far as Medeba*, or, *with fire as far as Medeba*.. Of this town the ruins are still visible at Madeba, between Hesban and Diban.

speak of his own people's triumph over the lately so proud Amorite conqueror. But different explanations are possible. The first two lines may express the call of the Israelites for the rebuilding and strengthening of the captured and destroyed city of Sihon—or, as Ewald [25] explains, a mocking invitation to the Amorite fugitives to do that, if they can—and the rest may be a half-sarcastic narrative of the fall of Moab first, and of Sihon's kingdom next. Some consider the whole song to be an Amorite composition, and the verses on the well to be likewise quoted from a non-Hebrew—a Moabitish—source. The wording of the concluding lines of the song is peculiar and obscure, and indicative of great antiquity.

Did the 'Book of the Wars of Jehovah' contain all these pieces? Did other songs incorporated in the Scriptures form a part of it? Did it contain a list of all the camping stations of Israel in the wilderness, and accounts of all the struggles ending in the conquest of Canaan, and, perhaps, even of national conflicts of a later period? Was it all composed in rhythmic style? Was it a connected work, or a collection of songs and fragments? Did it, in part at least, originate with the men who acted in the national affairs which it commemorated, or did a late collector string together strains and reminiscences of uncertain origin, and, perhaps, of dubious mean-

[25] 'History of Israel,' vol. ii. p. 206.

ing and authenticity? Did its contents form a considerable source of information for the prose writers of the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua, or was most of it lost when they wrote? Was it the source, direct or indirect, from which Amos, Hosea, Micah, and Isaiah drew their scanty reminiscences of the heroic age of Israel? Was its authorship ascribed to one of the commanders in the wars of the conquest? Was Moses, was Joshua, named in it? To all these questions no answer is to be found, or to be expected from criticism. The loss of the book is the more to be deplored as in it we have probably lost the principal key to the earliest history of Israel, the history of a period now full of obscurity.

XI.

Of all the legends referring to Israel's wanderings under the guidance of Moses none is so elaborately told, and so richly adorned with poetry, as the story of Balak and Balaam, given in the book of Numbers.[1] The narrative is so full, and so symmetrically rounded off, as to have the appearance of a little book in itself,[2] like the book of Ruth. The poetical element in it is so important that it may be presumed that what appears as a part of the Mosaic history was composed as a groundwork into which to weave the rhythmic strains of prophecy. And prose and poetry are so closely, so artistically, entwined, that the latter can not be presented without an abridgment, at least, of the former.

When Balak, the son of Zippor, king of Moab, heard what Israel had done to the neighboring kingdom of the Amorites, he and his people were seized with dread of the conquerors. After consulting with the elders of Midian,[3] he sent messengers to Balaam,

[1] xxii.–xxiv.

[2] It is so considered by Seinecke and Kalisch, among recent writers.

[3] The main division of Midian, dwelling east of Moab and in various adjoining parts. Moab and Midian appear closely connected, and even confounded with each other, in the accounts of their hostility to the Israelites led by Moses. This has caused a great deal of critical and uncritical speculation.

the son of Beor, the seer of Pethor on the River,[4] inviting him to come to Moab, there to curse the people that had come out of Egypt, and with whom Balak could not cope without supernatural assistance. The envoys, elders both of Moab and Midian, took rewards of divination with them, and delivered their message as commanded. Balaam promised to answer next morning, according to what Jehovah would tell him. In the night God appeared to him, and told him not to go: it would be vain to curse that people, for it was blessed. Balaam gave his reply accordingly, and the messengers, returning, reported it to Balak. The king thereupon sent another embassy, more numerous and more distinguished than the first, and repeated his request,

[4] On 'the river' Euphrates. Deut. xxiii. 5 has correspondingly 'Pethor in Aram-Naharaim' (Mesopotamia). And so Balaam himself says, 'From Aram Balak, Moab's king, brings me' (see below). These statements by far outweigh the authority of the ancient versions and old manuscripts according to which the translation of the verse before us would not be 'to Pethor, which is on the River, the land of the sons of *his people*' (*'ammō*)—that is, to Pethor on the Euphrates, his native place—but 'to Pethor, which is on the river of the land of the sons of *Ammôn*' (*'ammōn*). Schrader ('Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament,' p. 65) identifies Pethor with the Pithru (Pi-it-ru) of Shalmaneser II.'s black obelisk inscription, a place in the vicinity of the Euphrates. The name is derived from *pāthar*, to reveal, to interpret (dreams), and seems to indicate a head-quarters of oriental Magi, thus probably corresponding both in sound and meaning to the name of the oracle-city Patara in Lycia, a division of ancient Asia Minor in which several Semitic (Phœnician) names of places occur. (See Kiepert, 'Lehrbuch der alten Geographie,' p. 124.)

promising great honors in reward—anything that Balaam would ask of him. But the seer answered, 'If Balak would give me his house full of silver and gold, I could not go against the word of Jehovah, my God;' but he promised to inquire of Jehovah once more. God again appeared to him in the night, but this time told him, 'Go with the men; yet what I shall say to thee that shalt thou do.' And Balaam departed with Balak's princes.[5] The king, hearing of his coming, went to meet him at the City of Moab,[6] and thence conducted him to Kirjath-Huzoth,[7] where Balak offered oxen and sheep, and on the following morning they ascended Bamoth-Baal,[8] whence Balaam could discern the Israelitish camps. After ordering the erection of altars and the offering of sacrifices, Balaam left the king at the sacrificial spot, and ascended a hill, in the hope of receiving a revelation. And God met Balaam, and put a word into his mouth, and said, 'Return to Balak, and thus shalt thou speak.' He returned, and found the king standing by his burnt-offering, with all the princes of Moab around him. And he spoke thus in figurative words:

[5] The neatly told child's-story of the ass is here omitted for reasons alluded to below.

[6] See above, X., note 6.

[7] *City of Streets*, a place mentioned nowhere else, unless it be identical with Kerioth or with Kirjathaim.

[8] See above, X., note 13.

(Numbers XXIII. 7–10.)

'From Aram[9] Balak, Moab's king, brings me ;
from the mountains of the East :
"Come, curse for me Jacob ;
come, execrate Israel."
How shall I curse whom God curses not ?
how shall I execrate whom Jehovah execrates not ?
For from the summit of rocks I see him,
from hilltops I behold him :
lo, a people dwelling apart,
nor reckoning itself among the nations.
Who counts the dust of Jacob ?
who numbers the fourth part of Israel ?
May I die the death of the righteous,
and may my end be like theirs.'

And Balak said to Balaam, 'What hast thou done to me ? I brought thee to curse my enemies, and, behold, thou hast blessed them instead.' To which Balaam answered, 'Must I not faithfully speak what Jehovah puts into my mouth ?' Balak now conducted him to another spot, to the Seers' Field on the top of Pisgah,[10] from which only the extremity of the Israelitish camps could be seen : the enemy, appearing small, could, perhaps, more easily be cursed. New altars were erected, and new sacrifices offered, and Balaam again met Jehovah,

[9] Here used for Aram-Naharaim, the Aram of the two rivers (Euphrates and Tigris), that is, Mesopotamia.

[10] See above, X., note 14.

and on his return thus announced his word to the king and the princes, who stood waiting by the burnt-offering:

(XXIII. 18–24.)

'Rise, Balak, and hear;
listen to me, O son of Zippor:
God is not a man, that he should lie;
not the son of man, that he should repent;
if he has said, will he not do?
if he has spoken, will he not fulfil?
Lo, a blessing I have heard;[11]
he has blessed—I cannot reverse it.
He beholds no iniquity in Jacob,
sees no evil in Israel.
Jehovah, his God, is with him,
shouts for a king resound in his midst.
God leading him out of Egypt,
the wild buffalo's[12] rush is his.

[11] *I have heard*] See note E, at the end of the volume.

[12] *wild buffalo's*] The translation of the Hebrew *r'ēm* or *rēm*, after Gesenius, Robinson ('Biblical Researches,' vol. iii. p. 306), Kalisch, and others. The *r'ēm* is spoken of as an animal of great strength in Job xxxix. 9–12, and in parallelism with the lion in Ps. xxii. 22 (21). This strongly militates against its identification with a fierce species of antelope similarly named in Arabic, which, after Bochart, has found favor with many authorities, down to Mühlau and Volck, the last editors of Gesenius's Dictionary. The rendering *unicorn*, which is that of the Septuagint, Luther, and the English Authorized Version, is proved to be incorrect by the mention of 'the horns of the *r'ēm*' (Deut. xxxiii. 17; *cf.* Ps. xxii. 22). About the animal called *rīm* ('wilder Stier') in the Assyrian inscriptions see Schrader, 'Keilinschriften und Geschichtsforschung,' pp. 135, 136.

Yea, there is no enchantment in Jacob,
no divination in Israel ;
in due time Jacob, Israel, is told
what God is working.
Behold, a people that rises like a lioness,
lifts itself up like a lion ;
it lies not down before devouring prey,
before drinking the blood of the slain.'

And Balak said to Balaam, 'Neither curse him nor bless him.' Balaam answered, 'Have I not told thee that I must do all that Jehovah speaks?' Yet Balak made still another attempt to obtain a curse from Balaam, ascending with him the top of Mount Peor,[13] and sacrificing there. But this time, Balaam, knowing that it pleased Jehovah to bless Israel, sought no new revelation in the way he was wont to do, but turned toward the wilderness, and glanced over the tribes of Israel, resting in their tents. And the spirit of God came over him, and he spoke thus :

(XXIV. 3–10.)

'This is the oracle of Balaam, Beor's son,
the oracle of the man whose eye is locked ;[14]

[13] A mountain east of the northern extremity of the Dead Sea, according to Eusebius ; it was the seat of the worship of Baal-Peor. (See above, VII., note 5.)

[14] *locked*] According to the Vulgate, Abarbanel, Hupfeld, Rödiger, Hengstenberg, Mühlau and Volck, etc. ; others, following the Targum, the Septuagint, Saadiah, Aben Ezra, and Kimhi, translate *un-*

the oracle of him who hears the sayings of God,
and sees the vision of the Almighty—
prostrate, yet with eyes unlocked :
How beautiful are thy tents, O Jacob !
thy camp-dwellings, O Israel !
like vales spread out,
like gardens on river banks,
like aloe-trees planted by Jehovah,
like cedars by streams.
Water runs from his buckets,
where his seed lies abundant waters flow.
His king is higher than Agag,[15]
his kingdom exalted.
God leading him out of Egypt,
the wild buffalo's rush is his.
He devours nations, his foes,
and gnaws their bones—
crushes with his arrows.[16]

closed. Philologically both views are well supported. Whatever the meaning of the Hebrew participle may be, Balaam boasts of his inner sight, which allows him to see what his eye shut in sleep or virtually in a trance, or the eye of mortals generally, is unable to discern.

[15] The name of a king of Amalek, whom Saul, the first king of Israel, defeated and captured, and Samuel slew (I. Sam. xv.), and possibly also of earlier Amalekite princes.

[16] Others translate, *he shakes his arrows* (*in blood*), taking the verb *mā'haç* in the sense in which it is taken in Ps. lxviii. 24 (' so that thou shakest thy foot in the blood of thy foes ') ; but Hupfeld and others read there, instead of *tim'haç*, rendered *thou shakest*, *tir'haç*, thou bathest, comparing *yir'haç* in Ps. lviii. 11 (10) (' he bathes his feet in the blood of the wicked '). Knobel reads instead of חִצָּיו, his arrows,

He couches, lies down, like a lion,
like a lioness—who shall rouse him?
Blessed is whoever blesses thee,
Cursed whoever curses thee.'

Now Balak could no longer restrain his anger, but told Balaam to flee to his place. Before departing, however, Balaam revealed to the king the aspect of things in the remotest future. He said:

(XXIV. 15–19.)

'This is the oracle of Balaam, Beor's son,
the oracle of the man whose eye is locked;
the oracle of him who hears the sayings of God,
knows the knowledge of the Most High,
and sees the vision of the Almighty—
prostrate, yet with eyes unlocked:
I see him—not now;[17]
I behold him—not nigh.
A star breaks forth from Jacob,
a sceptre arises from Israel;
it crushes the sides of Moab,
overthrows all the men of tumult;[18]

קמיו, his adversaries, and translates, *he crushes his adversaries*, comparing מחץ מתנים קמיו, crush the loins of his adversaries (Deut. xxxiii. 11).

[17] *not now*] Not as existing now.

[18] *it . . . tumult*] The translation of the Masoretic text before us. Jeremiah however, who makes use of Balaam's utterance (Jer. xlviii. 45), has וקרקר for וקרקר (besides altering other words), accord-

Edom becomes a conquest,
Seir[19] a conquest of its foes ;
Israel does valiantly.
He from Jacob is master,[20]
and destroys the remnant in the cities.' [21]

Balaam then discerned Amalek, and said :

(XXIV. 20.)

' Foremost among nations was Amalek ;
his end tends to perdition.'

Seeing the Kenite,[22] he said :

ing to which the rendering of our sentence would be : *it crushes the sides* (or *temples*, Lat. *tempora*) *of Moab, and the crown of the head of all the men of tumult. Cf.* Ps. lxviii. 22 : ' God crushes . . . . the hairy crown of the head.'

[19] The mountain ridge of Edom, extending from the Dead Sea to the Gulf of Akabah, the north-east arm of the Red Sea, and originally inhabited by the Horites. The name is often used as synonymous with Edom.

[20] *He from Jacob is master*] So according to the Masoretic text, but its *v'yērd miyya'aqōb* has been conjectured to be a corruption of *v'yirdēm ya'aqōb*, and Jacob lords it over them.

[21] *in the cities*] Into which the fugitives escape after defeat in battle. ' As to the action, *cf.* Josh. x. 20, and as to מָעִיר, Ps. lxxii. 16, and Job xxiv. 12 ' (Knobel). Yet Obadiah, who reproduces some of Balaam's predictions (Ob. 17, 18), seems to have read משעיר, instead of מעיר. (*Cf.* Am. ix. 12.)

[22] *the Kenite*] Or Qayin, a tribe associated with the Amalekites or living on their border. They were considered descendants of Hobab, the father-in-law (or brother-in-law) of Moses (Judg. iv.

(XXIV. 21, 22.)

'Firm is thy seat,
upon a rock is set thy nest ;[23]
yet Qayin will be wasted.
Till when ?—Asshur carries thee away captive.'[24]

He then added :

(XXIV. 23, 24.)

'Alas ! who can live after God's appointing him ?[25]
Yet, ships come from Chittim's[26] shores,

11), and lived in friendship with the Israelites. When Saul marched against Amalek, he sent this message to the Kenites : 'Go, depart and descend from among the Amalekites, lest I destroy you with them ; yet ye showed kindness to all the children of Israel when they came up from Egypt' (I. Sam. xv. 6). At the conquest of Canaan, a portion of them had joined the tribe of Judah (Judg. i. 16) ; others, 'the house of Heber,' separating from the bulk of Qayin, migrated as far north as Kedesh in Naphtali, and lived peaceably there (Judg. iv. 11, 17) ; these were probably driven into captivity by the Assyrians, together with the Naphtalites.

[23] Literally, perhaps, *upon a rock set thou thy nest.* In the original there is a play upon words, the word for *nest* being *qēn,* that for *Kenite, qēnī,* and the collective name of the tribe, *qayin.*

[24] *yet . . . captive*] Or, *for, if Qayin is to be wasted—till when shall Asshur keep thee captive ?* ('Imperocchè se dovesse venire esterminato il Kenita—sino a quando deve l'Assiro tenerti in cattività ?'—Luzzatto.)

[25] *appointing him*] Appointing Asshur his rod of vengeance ; *cf.* Is. x. 5 *et seq.* As the Septuagint, however, heads this prediction with the words 'And seeing Og [= Agag]', Geiger ('Die Urschrift,' etc., p. 367) conjectured *missūmō ēl,* from God's appointing him, to be a corruption of *mishsh'māēl,* before Samuel. See above, note 15.

[26] Chittim, in the narrower sense, designates the island of

and afflict Asshur, and afflict Eber [27]—
and he, too, perishes.'

After speaking this, Balaam rose, and went, and returned to his place.

The Balaam of these chapters of Numbers—barring the episode of the ass and the angel,[28] which disagrees with the main parts of the narrative, and is considered [29] an interpolation by a later writer—is a grandly drawn figure. He is a seer of wide renown, popularly believed to be able to change the course of human events by enchantments, or by his influence over the divine counsels. He is offered rich rewards and honors for his services. He is far from being a vulgar deceiver, a diviner by trade. He is really in communion with God, the true God, practises divination as the highest of arts, and knows the limits of his gifts. Prostrate, with eyes powerless to see, but inwardly enlightened, he receives visions of the Almighty, and hears his oracles, which disclose the remote future; and, if allowed to speak, he announces what he sees and hears, faithfully and strictly, unbiassed by flattery or promise, unflinching

Cyprus, of which Citium was an important town, and, in the wider sense, probably, the islands and coasts of the eastern Mediterranean generally, especially those of the Grecian parts.

[27] *Eber*] Either the descendants of Eber, that is the Hebrews and kindred tribes (see Gen. x. 24 *et seq.*), or the Mesopotamians, inhabitants of the land *beyond the Euphrates* (*'ĕber hannāhār*).

[28] xxii. 21–35.

[29] By Seinecke and Kalisch, among many others.

before the powerful, unswayed by sympathy. He is the true mouthpiece of his Master, neither more nor less, and is coldly proud of this position.

But the Hebrews had also a different tradition of the seer of the East, which has been preserved in another chapter of Numbers,[30] and is alluded to in Joshua.[31] According to that, he was a vile heathen soothsayer, who, anxious to effect the ruin of Israel, gave the Midianites the advice to seduce that people to the licentious worship of Baal-Peor through their women — an advice which had a doubly baneful effect; and who, when vengeance was taken on the plotters and seducers, was slain together with the five chiefs of Midian. Balaam's anxiety to serve Balak against Israel is also presupposed in the episode of the ass and the angel, which tells of the wrath of God, and its strange consequences, on account of the seer's going to Moab, though he had asked and received permission to go.

Which of the two conceptions of Balaam was the older in the Hebrew legends, it is not easy to decide. The one hostile to the seer, which in later times was developed into horrid caricatures of him,[32] has the advantage of appearing among dry historical statements, while the other is presented to us in an elaborate sketch which is evidently the product of an

[30] xxxi.

[31] xiii. 21, 22.

[32] In the drawing of which Jewish and Christian writers vie with each other.

imaginative mind. The latter, on the other hand, has the apparent support of the prophet Micah, who makes God say, 'O my people, remember what Balak, King of Moab, devised, and what Balaam, Beor's son, answered him,' [33] and thus places the seer in antagonism to the king.

Whether either of the Hebrew traditions attached itself to a really historical character of the Semitic East, or whether the name of their hero is altogether mythical, is another question, which criticism is far from having definitely or harmoniously answered. Inquirers equally untrammelled by prepossessions reach opposite conclusions. Knobel, following Rödiger and Derenbourg, presumes Balaam to be identical with the sage and poet Lokman, whom the Arabs revere as the father of their gnomic, parable, and fable literature, and whose wisdom, as the Koran says, was from God. This Lokman, who is to be distinguished from the fabulous Lokman of the tribe of Ad, is supposed to have lived in the time of David. After the critical writers just mentioned, Kalisch, the author of the latest monograph on the Mesopotamian seer,[34] thus sums up the 'plausible coincidences' which 'seem to lend some support to the conjecture of Balaam's identity with the younger Lokman: 'The name signifies in Arabic "the devourer," as Balaam does in Hebrew; for it is nar-

[33] Mic. vi. 5.

[34] 'The Prophecies of Balaam,' forming the first part of his 'Bible Studies.'

rated that the former was not more conspicuous for wisdom than voracity.[35] Lokmân's father was *Bâura*, as Balaam's father was *Beor*. Lokmân is by Arabic writers counted among the descendants of Nahor, Abraham's brother, who lived in Mesopotamia, as Balaam did; although he is more generally described as an Abyssinian slave who, sold into Canaan during David's reign, was in personal intercourse with this king, adopted the religion of the Hebrews, and was buried in Ramlah or Ramah, amidst seventy prophets of Israel. In a Hebrew book of Enoch, the statement is found that, in the language of the Arabs, Balaam was called Lokmân.' 'However,' the writer adds, 'all these analogies are not conclusive. . . .' Nor are they to Nöldeke, to whom[36] 'Balaam is altogether a mythical apparition of much varying aspect,' and who has 'not the slightest doubt' that the first king of the Edomites—a people renowned for wisdom—Bela, son of Beor,[37] is identical with the prophet Balaam, son of Beor. A support for this conjecture he finds in the circumstance that Jerome knows two places of the name of Dannaba in the territory of ancient Moab, the scene of Balaam's activity, one of which may be identified with Dinhabah, the city of King Bela;[38] but he con-

[35] 'According to Wahl (Koran, p. 385), however, لقمان means "shrewd observer and counsellor"' (Kalisch).

[36] See his 'Untersuchungen zur Kritik des Alten Testaments,' p. 87.

[37] Gen. xxxvi. 32.

[38] *Ibid.*

siders the king and the prophet as equally mythical. The names are surely suspicious : Balaam, as well as Bela, is derived from a verb signifying *to devour*, *to destroy ;* Beor, from a verb signifying *to consume*, *to destroy ;*[39] Balak means *to waste ;* Pethor is a derivative of a verb signifying *to reveal.*

In literary correctness and finish, both the prose and poetry of the three chapters on Balaam are unsurpassed by anything to be found within the whole range of the Scriptures. The little work, if not ' one of the choicest masterpieces of universal literature,' which Kalisch believes it to be, is certainly the product of a most flourishing period of the literature of Israel. Which was that period ? To the author just mentioned, who believes in Davidic psalms—psalms marked by ' energetic sweetness,' breathing ' heroic force,' and betokening a splendid literary era—and strongly defends the view that all in Balaam's words that goes beyond the prophecy on Moab is a supplement belonging to a much later age, ' the following points seem evident :

' 1. All the tribes of Israel are described as inhabiting the land in security and prosperity. The date of the Book is, therefore, neither before Joshua nor after the reign of the kings of Israel, Menahem and Pekah (B.C. 770–740), when the first Assyrian deportations took place under Pul or Tiglath-pileser.

' 2. The people are constituted as a monarchy.

[39] In one of these meanings the verb is used by Balaam himself (Num. xxiv. 22).

The section belongs, therefore, to a time not anterior to Samuel.

'3. *One* king rules the country, and Jacob and Israel are identical. There is no trace of an allusion to the disruption of the kingdom, the whole people forming one commonwealth, irresistible through their unity. The pieces can, therefore, have only been written in the time of the undivided kingdom, under Saul, David, or Solomon.

'4. The Moabites are mentioned as utterly vanquished and humbled. They were, indeed, defeated by Saul, but his success was neither brilliant nor decisive, and is, in the Hebrew records, but cursorily stated, together with other military advantages. Moreover, the power of the Hebrews and their position among the nations were, in Saul's time, not of that eminence upon which these chapters dwell so emphatically. There remains, therefore, only the alternative between the reign of David and that of Solomon. But

'5. This section breathes, on the whole, a warlike spirit. The country is still compelled to remain fully prepared against watchful adversaries: "Behold, it is a people that rises up as a lioness, . . ." or Israel "devoureth the nations, his enemies. . . ." Such descriptions do not harmonize with the peaceful times of King Solomon.

'6. The Book of Balaam was, therefore, most probably written in the latter part of David's reign (about B.C. 1030), when it was inspired by those glo-

rious triumphs over the Moabites and other rebellious foes, which the last prophecy introduces with such peculiar power and pride.' [40]

This is all logically put together, but open to a fatal objection: The age of David was not the golden age of Hebrew poetry, in which originated masterpieces characterized by 'that natural splendor or beauty of imagery, which, in every touch, reveals the genius and the poet,' and by a diction in which 'there is hardly a single obscurity.' [41] There are no Davidic psalms, at least none for the authenticity of which there is sufficient intrinsic evidence. Whatever else is ascribed to David is equally of more than questionable authenticity. The age of David was not an age of blissful peace and innocence, apt to inspire a poet with visions of an ideal present, or a prophet with the resolution to compose an unqualified glorification of his contemporaries—a thing for which we in vain look in the writings of Israel. It was a time of terrible warfare and despotism, of fratricidal feud and parricidal rebellion, of wholesale executions and of assassinations in the highest circles. It was probably a time of still lingering barbarism in everything; in religion, literature, and language no less than in civil life.

Nor was the reign of Solomon, or that of any of his successors in Judah or Israel, a period which could elicit the idealizing eulogy of a high-minded

[40] 'Bible Studies,' part i. pp. 42–44.

[41] *Ibid.*, p. 265.

contemporary writer. The reign of Jeroboam II., for which Oort is anxious to vindicate that honor,[42] was certainly not an era when God beheld no iniquity in Israel, when the tents of Jacob were like aloe-trees planted by Jehovah. Read what Amos, a contemporary, knew about that reign. A spirit of abject adulation, assumed in the writer, would, of course, remove the difficulty of ascribing a picture of combined warlike power and idyllic happiness to almost any reign ; but such an assumption is contrary to all our experience in the field of Scriptural poetry, besides leaving the objections to special identifications of the 'star from Jacob' intact.

The truth is, the images of power and felicity so vividly pictured in the chapters before us are such as the poets and prophets of Israel were wont to see in the remote future or in a remote past, in a future or past *toto cœlo* different from the gloomy present. When our writer put his glorification of his people into the mouth of a foreign seer, the remote past of the people had undergone a transfiguration in song and legend. The rough nomadic life of its first ancestors had been transformed into a long migration under the guidance of a benign and ever-watchful shepherd, wielding a miracle-working wand, and daily communing with God himself: the tents of those nomads, under such auspices, must have been pleasant indeed. The first king, whom history, dis-

[42] In his 'Disputatio de Pericope Num. xxii. 2–xxiv.,' and also in 'The Bible for Young People' (part i. book iii. ch. xvii.).

torted history, describes as a madman, was remembered as the conqueror of Agag, the destroyer of the nation's oldest enemy. His successor David, who made Israel powerful, but 'shed blood abundantly,'[43] had been exalted into a type of royal greatness and a model of piety, and his sceptre into a sacred sign of unity and prosperity: he, indeed, was a star beaming with glory; his sceptre did pierce the sides of Moab. When our poet wrote—and he wrote at a time when Hebrew style had attained its perfection, that is, when his people was divided and constantly harassed, or had already been crushed by the Chaldeans—a poet's picture of the bright past, like the prophet's vision of the brighter future, was a soothing balm to the lacerated hearts in Israel. He chose a poetical subject of very ancient times, which the legends offered him, and which allowed him to merge the poet in the prophet, to use the glowing tints of vision, to combine ages, and to reflect the past in the sketch of a future—which might still come to be.

Did the prophet Micah, a man of the latter half of the eighth century before Christ, learn from our author 'what Balak devised, and Balaam answered'? or did both draw their knowledge of it from a common source? If the predictions of the Mesopotamian seer concerning Edom, Amalek, the Kenites, and Asshur are an addition by a writer or writers of a later period, the former supposition is more plausi-

[43] I. Chr. xxii. 8.

ble ; if not, the latter is. And the brevity, abruptness, and partial obscurity of these concluding pieces, as well as the loose and unsymmetrical way in which they are connected with the rest and with each other, offer strong, though not conclusive, arguments against the general notion of their forming parts of the original composition. But it is not easy to comprehend what interest may have induced a late writer to affix to an earlier production directed against Moab cursory mentions of Amalek and the Kenites, tribes which in his time, if they still existed, must have lost all importance. In the original work these tribes might naturally have been introduced as lying before the eyes of the seer, who, after looking over Israel, to the north and north-east of him, turned first toward Moab, on the south-east and south, and then toward the south-west and west, where he beheld in succession the mountains of Edom, the abodes of the Amalekites, and the ridges occupied by the Kenites. From the sight of the last-named tribe his spirit wanders toward a fragment of it in the north, which—in the writer's own time, if he was a contemporary of Micah—Asshur carried away captive.[44] And it is in this period of Assyrian invasion that most critics consider the work to have been composed, and composed entire, as we have it.

The introduction of Chittim—that is, of Cyprus, or of the Cittæans of the Mediterranean in general—

[44] See note 22.

is the most perplexing feature of the whole. An explanation has been sought in the following relation which Josephus[45] gives after Menander, who, according to him, extracted it from the archives of Tyre: 'One whose name was Eluleus reigned [in Tyre] thirty-six years: this king, upon the revolt of the Cittæans, sailed to them, and reduced them again to a submission. Against these did the king of Assyria [Shalmaneser, after the capture of Samaria] send an army, and in a hostile manner overrun all Phœnicia, but soon made peace with them all, and returned back; but Sidon, and Ace, and Palætyrus revolted; and many other cities there were which delivered themselves up to the king of Assyria. Accordingly, when the Tyrians would not submit to him, the king returned, and fell upon them again, while the Phœnicians had furnished him with threescore ships, and eight hundred men to row them; and when the Tyrians had come upon them in twelve ships, and the enemy's ships were dispersed, they took five hundred men prisoners; and the reputation of all the citizens of Tyre was thereby increased; but the king of Assyria returned, and placed guards at their rivers and aqueducts, who should hinder the Tyrians from drawing water. This continued for five years; and still the Tyrians bore the siege, and drank of the water they had out of the wells they dug.' If the Cittæans of Cyprus, resubjected by the Tyrians, bore

[45] 'Antiquities,' IX. xiv. 2 (Whiston's translation).

a conspicuous part in the naval warfare with the Assyrians, and the subsequent struggle on the mainland, they, it is presumed,[46] may be the Chittim whose ships 'afflicted Asshur, and afflicted Eber,' that is, Asshur's Mesopotamian allies or troops.[47] Asshur's fall may then have been expected, or already have taken place, if the last verse was written after the destruction of Sennacherib's army. The last remnant of Amalek was destroyed about the same time by a band of Simeonites, according to I. Chronicles.[48]

There is still a bolder conjecture concerning Chittim and Asshur, as mentioned in the last prediction. It is thus stated by Seinecke:[49] 'At the end two eastern powers are named: Assyria and Eber, that is, the land beyond the river, Babylonia. These are pressed by the Cittæans. Now the question is, what meaning is to be attached to the word "Cittæans"? That Cyprus or even the Phœnicians should have subdued the Assyrian and Babylonian power, as the text has it, is against history. But in the usage of late times, "Cittæans" does not signify Cyprus or Phœnician colonies, but the Macedonians. Thus at the beginning of the first book of Maccabees, Alexander the Great is called king of the Cittæans; in the same way, in the eighth chapter,

[46] By Knobel and others.

[47] See note 27.

[48] iv. 42, 43.

[49] 'Geschichte des Volkes Israel,' vol. i. p. 186.

Philip and Perseus are designated kings of the Cittæans. This meaning is the best applicable here. The world-power Assyria and Babylonia is one day to fall under the power of Macedon. According to this, insertions in the Pentateuch were made at a late time.' 'At a very late time,' would be more appropriate—and here is the rub.

XII.

The close of the career of Moses is described in the last chapters of the Pentateuch[1] in a very effective, chastely pathetic way. He assembled the people, and delivered a parting address, exhorting them to remember the wonders which Jehovah had wrought for them in Egypt and in the wilderness, to stand firm by the covenant with him, not to mind lightly the curse pronounced over its transgressors, to observe the ordinances and statutes of the law, to choose wisely between life and death, and good and evil, and to be courageous in the contest for Canaan, soon to be waged under Joshua. He then briefly exhorted this his successor to do his work bravely and fearlessly, and delivered the book of the law to the priests and elders, ordering the reading of it, at the end of every seven years, before all the people, men, women, children, and strangers. To the book of the law a song was added, at Jehovah's dictation, which was to serve as a witness against Israel in times to come, when apostasy should have done its worst. Moses wrote out the song, and taught it the children of Israel, and, assembling the elders of the tribes and the officers, recited it before them to the end. He and Joshua also recited it before all the people. There are in the relation no less than six

[1] Deut. xxix.–xxxiv.

mentions of 'this song,' which is contained in the thirty-second chapter of Deuteronomy. After a few more words of admonition addressed to the people, Moses, 'on that very day,' received the divine command to ascend Mount Nebo, in the land of Moab, opposite Jericho, to see from there the land of Canaan, which was to be occupied by Israel, but which *he* was not to enter, and to die on the mountain. And Moses went up from the plains of Moab to Mount Nebo, to the top of Pisgah,[2] and Jehovah showed him all the land of Gilead, and all Naphtali, and the land of Ephraim and Manasseh, and all the land of Judah, and the South, and the valley of Jericho, as far as Zoar.[3] And after thus seeing the land of promise, Moses died on the mountain, and 'no man knows of his sepulchre to this day.'

The poetical address designated as the 'song,' which is so emphatically introduced, is a work of wonderful power, of almost unparalleled national and religious fervor, and in many respects one of the gems of Hebrew literature, if not of the poetry of all nations; but it not only is not Mosaic, as its contents and diction evidently show, but it does not even betray the least effort on the part of its author to make it appear Mosaic.[4] If the author of Deuteronomy found it, he may have been so dazzled by

[2] See above, X., note 14.

[3] At the southern extremity of the Dead Sea.

[4] For this reason it will be given in this work at its real place in history.

its grandeur as to believe it the divinely inspired utterance of the greatest of prophets. If the Deuteronomist wrote it himself, he was too violently carried away by the tragic aspect of things before him, and by a burning desire to achieve the regeneration of his fallen people, to sacrifice a single word which the time demanded to the exigencies of the assumed rôle. Moses living *then* would *thus* have spoken. The writer *could* not speak differently. The preamble alone must suffice to give a Mosaic, a divine, sanction to the voice of mingled mourning and hope which was to shake the dry bones of Israel into new life. And it is, perhaps, therefore that the preamble speaks so emphatically of 'this song.'

In striking contrast with the song, a 'blessing with which Moses, the man of God, blessed the children of Israel before his death' is most carelessly—without any preamble or remark as to the precise time or place of utterance—introduced between the words of Jehovah ordering his servant to ascend Mount Nebo and the words 'And Moses went up. . . .' This piece is evidently not a part of the Deuteronomist's original narrative, but an insertion by a later redactor. Its contents, similar to those of the Blessing of Jacob,[5] prove it to be neither the work of the Hebrew lawgiver nor that of a contemporary of the late historian who described his death. When the Blessing of Moses—that is, what we designate by

[5] See above, V.

this title—was composed, the tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh, of Zebulun and Issachar, of Naphtali and Asher—as the sayings referring to them show—had occupied their cantons west of the Jordan, in the land which Moses was only to see from a distance, and, on the other hand, none of these tribes had yet been carried into Assyrian captivity. A 'king in Jeshurun' is also mentioned, but that term may refer to Jehovah as ruler of his nation, or to Moses as supreme leader. Whether the author wrote his blessing in the guise of Moses, and wrote it as it is, or whether the redactor who inserted it in Deuteronomy added or changed the superscription, and also altered such expressions as 'Benjamin, Jehovah's favorite, . . .' and 'Joseph, blessed of Jehovah is his land,' which the writer used in his own person, into such as 'Of Benjamin he said, "Jehovah's favorite, . . ."' or 'And of Joseph he said, "Blessed of Jehovah is his land,"' cannot be determined with certainty. The mention, in the exordium, of Moses himself, in the third person, is, however, a strong argument against the former supposition, unless we consider the exordium and epilogue as additions to the original work by a different author. As we have it, the Blessing reads thus:

(Deuteronomy XXXIII.)

(1) This is the blessing with which Moses, the man of God, blessed the children of Israel before his death. He said:

'Jehovah came from Sinai,
rose in light from Seir to them ;[6]
he shone forth from Mount Paran,[7]
and advanced from amidst holy myriads ;[8]
from his right hand flamed the law[9] for them.

[6] *to them*] In Heb. לָמוֹ, which stands perhaps for לְעַמּוֹ, to his people ; *cf.* Ps. lxviii. 8 (7).

[7] A ridge extending between Mount Sinai and the mountains of Seir or Edom. Jehovah is represented as advancing from Seir, from Paran, from Sinai, to meet his people coming from Egypt, and 'represented under the image of the sun shining up in the east, and in its rise immediately embracing a vast horizon with the splendor of its rays' (Volck). The same picture is to be found in the Song of Deborah (Judg. v. 4, 5), in the prayer of Habakkuk (Hab. iii. 3, 4), and in Ps. lxviii. 8, 9 (7, 8).

[8] *and advanced from amidst holy myriads*] So according to the text, as we have it ; the reference is understood to be to angels. Ps. lxviii., the author of which seems to have had the Blessing of Moses before him, apparently also speaks of two myriads of angels (v. 18 [17]) ; but as the directly preceding words are 'God's chariots,' and Habakkuk, who also seems to have had the Blessing before him (see note 7), speaks (iii. 8) of Jehovah's riding on his triumphant chariots, the original text was, perhaps, instead of וְאָתָה מִרְבְּבֹת קֹדֶשׁ, and advanced from myriads of holiness, וְאִתּוֹ מַרְכְּבֹת קֹדֶשׁ, and with him the chariots of holiness (his holy chariots). The Samaritan text actually has וְאִתּוֹ ; the Septuagint, Onkelos, the Vulgate, and the Syriac seem all to have read so ; and the difference between מִרְבְּבֹת and מַרְכְּבֹת is hardly perceptible.

[9] *flamed the law*] Literally—according to the Masoretically corrected text—*the fire of the law* (*ēsh dāth*) ; but as the word for law, *dāth*, occurs elsewhere only in books of a very late age, and is apparently of Persian origin, various slightly modified readings have been suggested by Knobel, Böttcher, and others, according to which the rendering would be, *shooting rays*, or *shooting fire*, in accordance with Hab. iii. 4.

'He loved the tribes—
all the saints were in thy[10] hand;
they lay at thy feet,
received[11] thy words.
Moses taught us a law,
the possession of the community of Jacob.
(5) And there was[12] a king in Jeshurun,[13]
when the heads of the people assembled,
all the tribes of Israel.
'Let Reuben live, and not die,
nor his men be few.'[14]

And this of Judah. He said:

'Hear, O Jehovah, Judah's voice,
and bring him to his people;
with his hands he fights for himself,
and thou aidest him against his foes.'

[10] *thy*] Refers to Jehovah, as generally explained.

[11] *all the saints . . . received*] Literally *all his saints . . . he received*, the pronominal Hebrew suffix and prefix referring probably to Israel; but the whole passage is very obscure, and many explanations have been attempted, none of which is satisfactory.

[12] *there was*] Or, *he was;* see above.

[13] *Jeshurun*] A symbolical name for Israel, probably designating *the upright*, from *yāshar*, to be right. It occurs only four times in the Scriptures: twice in the chapter before us, in Deut. xxxii. 15, and in Is. xliv. 2, where, 'Jacob and Jeshurun' form a parallel, as Jacob and Israel do in the preceding verse. 'It is a title of honor for Israel, and at the same time imitates the sound of Israel's name' (Kuenen).

[14] In the original a negative particle is here implied from the preceding clause; the same construction is found in Ps. xxxviii. 2 (1), and Ps. lxxv. 6 (5).

And of Levi he said :

'Thy truth-and-light [15]
is with thy pious man,
who was tried by thee at Massah,
with whom thou strovest at the waters of Meribah ;[16]
who says of his father and his mother,
"I have not seen them ;"
who recognizes not his brothers,
and knows not his sons—[17]
for they keep thy word,
and guard thy covenant.
(10) They teach Jacob thy judgments,
Israel thy law ;
they place incense before thee,
whole-burnt sacrifice upon thy altar.
Bless his power, O Jehovah ;
favor the work of his hands ;

[15] *truth-and-light*] Generally *light-and-truth* (*ūrīm v'thummīm*), the designation of a part of the Hebrew high-priest's breast-plate, or of something connected with it, which was used in eliciting divine oracles.

[16] *Massah . . . Meribah*] These names, signifying *trial* and *strife*, were applied to the respective localities on account of occurrences spoken of, or alluded to, in Ex. xvii. 1–7, Num. xx. 1–13, 24, and xxvii. 14, Deut. vi. 16, and ix. 22, and elsewhere. In the verse before us the conduct of the Levite Aaron in those occurrences is alluded to, but apparently according to traditions somewhat at variance with the relations in Exodus and Numbers.

[17] *who says . . . sons*] An allusion to the ready obedience of the Levites in avenging the golden calf outrage on friend and neighbor, son and brother (Ex. xxxii. 27–29).

crush the loins of his adversaries,
of all who hate him, so that they rise not again.'

Of Benjamin he said :

'Jehovah's favorite,
he dwells by him securely ;
he screens him all day,
and rests between his shoulders.' [18]

And of Joseph he said :

'Blessed of Jehovah is his land :
for the precious things of heaven, for dew,[19]
and the deep spread out below ;
for the precious products of the sun,
and the precious yield of the moon ;[20]
(15) for things from the summits of primeval mountains,
and the precious things of everlasting hills ;
for the precious things of the earth in its fulness,
and the favor of him who dwelt in the bush—[21]

[18] Jerusalem, the seat of Jehovah's sanctuary, lay on the confines of the tribes of Benjamin and Judah. The Masoretic text contains here twice the word *'ālāv* (by him, over him), but the Samaritan, the Syriac, and the Vulgate render it only once ; the second *'ālāv* is probably there by mistake, and the first is to be connected with the following *'hōphēph*.

[19] *for dew*] Heb. מטל, obviously a corruption of מעל, above, the corresponding word in the Blessing of Jacob (Gen. xlix. 25), which is in perfect parallelism with תהת, below, following in both places.

[20] *Cf.* V., note 43.

[21] Jehovah, who appeared to Moses in a burning bush ; see Ex. iii.

all this comes upon Joseph's head,
upon the crown of the crowned one among his brethren.[22]
His first-born bullock is superb,[23]
the wild buffalo's[24] horns are his;
with them he thrusts the nations,
all, to the ends of the earth—
Such are the myriads of Ephraim,
such the thousands of Manasseh.'

And of Zebulun he said:

'Rejoice, O Zebulun, in thy going out,
and thou, O Issachar, in thy tents.[25]
They call tribes to the mountain,
and offer there sacrifices of righteousness;[26]

[22] See above, V., note 46.

[23] Ephraim is meant, whom Jacob placed above his elder brother Manasseh; see Ex. xlviii.

[24] See above, XI., note 12.

[25] Zebulun was a trading and seafaring tribe, Issachar was devoted to husbandry; *cf.* the corresponding verses in the Blessing of Jacob (Gen. xlix. 13, 14), and the lines following here.

[26] Allusions either to Mount Carmel, on or near the confines of both tribes, and to festive gatherings of an almost national character, at which righteous sacrifices—that is, sacrifices in honor of Jehovah—were offered, as in the time of Elijah (see I. Kings xviii.), or to Mount Tabor, directly on the common border, whither the tribes were called to fight with Zebulun and Issachar, under Deborah and Barak, against Sisera, and to sacrifices of thanks and rejoicing after the victory (see Judg. iv., v.). If the latter view be correct, *sacrifices of victory* ought to be substituted in the translation for *sacrifices of righteousness*, the

for they suck the abundance of the seas,
treasures buried in the sand.' [27]

(20) And of Gad he said:

'Praised be he who enlarges Gad.
He dwells like a lioness,
and tears arm and crown of head.
He selected a first part for himself,[28]
where the field of the hidden lawgiver[29] lies:

second noun in the Hebrew, *çedeq*, signifying not only *justice* and *righteousness*, but also *victory* (Gesenius), or *a saving act of divine justice* (Mühlau and Volck's Gesenius), and the synonymous *ç'dāqāh* being thus used in Deborah's Song (Judg. v. 11) in reference to that very victory at Mount Tabor. The words, however, which follow in the lines before us speak of abundance, not of victory.

[27] The sea adjoining the territory of Zebulun enriched the Phœnicians, and probably also that tribe and its neighbor Issachar, by an abundant supply of the shell-fish which yielded the famous purple dye of the Tyrians, while from the sand of the river Belus, which emptied into the sea north of Mount Carmel, costly glass was manufactured. The fish of the Sea of Galilee, or Lake of Gennesaret, may also be included in 'the abundance of the seas.'

[28] The first territories conquered by the Israelites, those taken from Sihon, were given by Moses to Gad and Reuben, at their own request. For this grant of land, east of the Jordan, the two tribes bound themselves to march armed before the children of Israel across that river, and not to return before the final conquest of Canaan (see Num. xxxii.). This leading in the conquest is alluded to in the following lines.

[29] The unknown burial-ground of Moses, as Onkelos and the Vulgate understood it; 'der Antheil des Gesetzgebers, des Verborgenen' (Sachs); 'il campo del legislatore, sepolto' (Luzzatto, who, believing in the Mosaic authorship of the Blessing, adds: 'ultimo sfogo del

and marched at the head of the people,
achieving Jehovah's victory,[30]
his judgments for Israel.'

And of Dan he said :

'Dan is a lion's whelp,
such as leaps forth from Bashan.' [31]

And of Naphtali he said :

'Naphtali is satiated with favor,
full of the blessing of Jehovah—
sea and southland conquer thou.' [32]

And of Asher he said :

'Blessed above other sons is Asher,
favored among the brethren—
he bathes his foot in oil.

dolore di Mosè, condannato a morire fuori della Cananea '). Ewald, Baumgarten, Fürst, and others explain the text in the same way ; others, like Knobel and Volck, render : *the portion of a leader, reserved,* meaning a leader's portion in the fruits of conquest, reserved for the returning Gadites.

[30] See above, note 26.

[31] The northern division of Transjordanic Palestine, between the Jabbok and Mount Hermon, renowned for its pastures and oak forests ; parts of it are mountainous. It is not improbable that the Danites, in executing their assault on Laish (see Judg. xviii.), crossed the upper Jordan, in order to veil their design, and fell upon that town from the side of Bashan.

[32] A hot region, tempered by sea breezes (Knobel, Volck). 'Sea' refers, perhaps, to the Sea of Galilee (Onkelos), and 'southland' to the southern portion of Naphtali, which bordered on that lake.

(25) Iron and brass is thy bolt,[33]
and long as thy days is thy peace.[34]
'There is none like God, O Jeshurun,
who rides on heavens to aid thee,
in triumph above the clouds.
A refuge is the God of old,
a resting place[35] are the everlasting arms.
He chased the foe before thee,
and said, "Destroy."
And Israel dwells in safety,
undisturbed is Jacob's fountain;
in a land of corn and wine,
which the heavens bedew.
Happy art thou, O Israel;
who is like thee,
O people victorious through Jehovah?
He is thy shield of help,
thy sword of triumph.
Thy enemies cringe before thee,
and thou treadest on their heights.'

[33] *bolt*] The rendering of *min'āl*, which occurs only here, and is considered by Rosenmüller, Gesenius, Maurer, Graf, and others to have the same meaning as *man'ūl;* others, however, following the Septuagint, the Vulgate, and the Syriac, render *shoe*, the common Hebrew term for which is *na'al.*

[34] *peace*] One of many widely divergent conjectural renderings of *dobe*, which occurs nowhere else in the Bible.—Affluence and power combined, from which springs tranquil enjoyment, are thus stated to be the lot of Asher, the 'happy,' as his name denotes.

[35] *resting place*] Heb. *mitta'hath*, or *matta'hath*, a thing stretched out, spread out, to rest upon, from *mātha'h* (freely after Graf).

The most striking feature of the Blessing, as we have it, is the ignoring of Simeon. The Blessing of Jacob mentions some of the sons of the patriarch with praise, and others with bitter reproach, but none is forgotten. The Blessing of Moses has no vituperation for a single one, but it omits one name entirely. This difficulty has sorely perplexed commentators and critics. Of the latter some discovered a solution in the reading of some manuscripts of the Septuagint, which have the name Simeon, and according to which the blessing bestowed in the Hebrew text on Reuben alone is to be divided between him and his eldest brother. Others [36] found the reason of the omission in the post-Mosaic circumstances of the tribe of Simeon, which ended in being partly merged in Judah, and partly established in pastoral abodes outside of the Israelitish territory, so that it hardly deserved to be reckoned among the main divisions of Israel by a writer of a late age. Nor are these the only conjectures ventured on the subject which fail to satisfy the close examiner of the text and its historical background. A perfectly satisfactory solution has, however, recently been made public by Graetz,[37] drawn from a source as old as the Talmud. It is contained in the twentieth of the thirty-two rules of Pentateuch exegesis ascribed

[36] Among them Hoffmann and Graf, who have devoted exhaustive special treatises to the chapter before us. Graf's alone, 'Der Segen Mose's erklärt,' is independently published and complete.

[37] 'Geschichte der Juden,' vol. ii. part i. pp. 486, 487.

to Rabbi Eliezer, the son of Yose the Galilean, a Talmudical authority of the second century of the Christian era. That rule allows the transfer of words of the Torah which have no meaning at their place to another place where their meaning becomes clear, and according to it Rabbi Eliezer plainly proposes to read 'And this of Simeon,' instead of 'And this of Judah.' Consequently the blessing must read, 'Hear, O Jehovah, Simeon's voice [not 'Judah's'], and bring him to his people,' which perfectly well applies to the half lost, half expatriated tribe of Simeon. A striking evidence in favor of the emendation lies in the very words of the first line, which, in the corrected form, play upon each other: *Sh'ma'* (hear) . . . . *Shim'ōn* (Simeon), exactly in accordance with the statement in Genesis[38] that Simeon was so named by Leah because Jehovah had heard (*shāma'*) that she was hated, and had given her that son, too. Another proof for the correctness of Rabbi Eliezer's emendation is that it restores in the Blessing the order of the first three sons of Jacob, both according to their birth and in agreement with the blessing ascribed to the patriarch himself,[39] while in the text as we have it not only Simeon is wanting, but Judah stands before his elder brother Levi. The alteration has the still greater merit of removing the necessity of explaining the words 'And bring him [or, bring him back] to

[38] xxix. 33.

[39] See Gen. xxix. 32–34, and xlix. 3–5.

his people' in reference to Judah, a necessity which, as Graetz observes, has been productive both of desperate attempts at explanation and of false conclusions.

But if the alteration is made in the text, where is there a mention of Judah, a tribe incomparably more important than Simeon? Graetz knew that 'for Judah, too, there is an allusion,' but he did not stop to point it out, only incidentally touching upon the subject. In fact, there is much more than an allusion: Judah receives his full share, though in two now disjointed parts. Even years before Graetz published the volume to which we owe the preceding remarks, Kohler,[40] pointing out a double incongruity presented by the text—viz., that Judah, a powerful and ruling tribe, is treated to comparatively so insignificant a blessing, and Levi, a tribe devoted to priestly service, to one implying constant victories in deadly warfare—suggested this plain and obviously correct solution:[41] We restore the order of the tribes, now deranged, by placing the blessing of Judah, beginning with the emphatic 'And this,' in verse 7, after verse 10, and thus refer verse 11 to Judah. And by combining the emendations suggested by Kohler and Graetz, we obtain a strong linguistic evidence in favor of both, for Judah's blessing then

[40] 'Der Segen Jacob's,' p. 5. Kohler's monograph appeared in 1867, the second volume of Graetz's 'History' in 1875.

[41] Kuenen ('Religion of Israel,' vol. i. p. 381) hardly does justice to it by calling it an 'attractive conjecture.'

naturally begins with the word *yādāv* (his hands), in verse 7, which is repeated in verse 11, and plays upon the name *y'hūdāh* (Judah), exactly as both *yād'khā*, thy hand, and *yōdūkhā*, praise thee, play upon that very name in the Blessing of Jacob.[42]

In order to have the advantages derived from the suggested alterations clearly before our eyes, let us place an abridged translation of the Blessing of Moses, as we presume it to have been composed originally, in juxtaposition to the translation given above ; thus :

Let Reuben live, and not die,
nor his men be few.
Hear, O Jehovah, Simeon's voice,
and bring him to his people.
Thy truth-and-light
is with Levi, thy pious man,
who was tried by thee at Massah,
with whom thou strovest at the waters of Meribah ;
who says of his father and his mother,
' I have not seen them ;'
who recognizes not his brothers,
and knows not his sons—
for they keep thy word,
and guard thy covenant.
They teach Jacob thy judgments,
Israel thy law ;

[42] Gen. xlix. 8.

they place incense before thee,
whole-burnt sacrifice upon thy altar.

Judah with his hands fights[43] for himself,
and thou aidest him against his foes ;
bless his power, O Jehovah,
favor the work of his hands ;
crush the loins of his adversaries,
of all who hate him, so that they rise not again.

Benjamin, Jehovah's favorite,
dwells securely ;
he screens him all day,
and rests between his shoulders.

Joseph's land is blessed of Jehovah :[44]
for the precious things of heaven above,
and of the deep spread out below. . . .

Rejoice, O Zebulun, in thy going out,
and thou, O Issachar, in thy tents. . . .

Praised be he who enlarges Gad.
He dwells like a lioness,
and tears arm and crown of head. . . .

Dan is a lion's whelp,
such as leaps forth from Bashan.

Naphtali is satiated with favor,
full of the blessing of Jehovah—
sea and southland conquer thou.

Blessed above other sons is Asher,
favored among the brethren. . . .[45]

[43] The word *rāb* in the text signifies both *fights* and *he fights* (as given above).

[44] Literally, *Joseph—blessed of Jehovah is his land.*

[45] For parallel texts in Hebrew, see note F, at the end of the volume.

One of the less intrinsic differences between the Blessings of Jacob and Moses is this: The one before us has both a poetical exordium and a poetical epilogue; the other has neither. Another difference lies in the arrangement of the sayings concerning the tribes. The Blessing of Jacob observes an order tolerably agreeing with the family relations in the house of the patriarch: First come the oldest four sons—Reuben, Simeon, Levi, and Judah, all children of Jacob's first wife, Leah; then their two brothers by the same mother—Zebulun and Issachar; then the four sons of Jacob by the two handmaids—Dan, Gad, Asher, and Naphtali, though not separated according to their mothers; and finally the two sons by his favorite wife, Rachel—Joseph and Benjamin, the youngest of all. The placing of the verse devoted to Naphtali after the blessing of Dan would render the order almost perfect. It would only leave the mention of Zebulun before Issachar to be explained, and the explanation is easy: the beautiful contrast between Zebulun, who for gain risked the perils of the sea and was free, and Issachar, who found rest so good and the land so pleasant that he bent his shoulder and served, could best be executed by drawing the idyllic but somewhat ludicrous figure of the elder brother last. In the Blessing of Moses, on the other hand, the order seems to be partly genealogical, but mainly geographical. First come the tribes descended from the oldest sons of Jacob, and occupying the southern

belt of Palestine, on both sides of the Dead Sea;[46] then those inhabiting the centre of the country—Benjamin, Ephraim and Manasseh (Joseph), Zebulun, and Issachar; and last, four tribes dwelling on exposed borders of the country—Gad, Dan, Naphtali, and Asher—in tolerably good geographical order, if we consider that a detached portion of Dan occupied a small territory bordering on the north-east of Naphtali. That Zebulun is here, too, placed before Issachar, both against the genealogical and the geographical order, is probably owing to their being coupled in a contrast which is apparently an epitome of the corresponding words of Jacob.

But what chiefly distinguishes the Blessing of Moses from the Blessing of Jacob is the spirit that pervades it: a spirit of mild and cheerful piety, of loving patriotism, of indiscriminating charity, which refreshingly contrasts with the partiality, insidiousness, and fierceness characterizing the so-called Blessing of the patriarch. Here Reuben is not, as he is there, charged with an infamous crime: though almost annihilated—by the constant attacks of Moab and other neighbors—he shall continue to live as a tribe, and recuperate. Simeon is not a mob with murderous instincts, deserving to be scattered: his praying voice shall be heard, and he shall be restored as a tribe to his people. Levi is not Simeon's ferocious accomplice, whose wrath equally deserves

[46] The bulk of the tribe of Levi lived in Jerusalem and neighboring localities.

a father's curse: it is a tribe of pious men, devoted to the worship of Jehovah and the teaching of his law, and only therefore distributed in Israel. Judah is not a lion rising from prey: he fights manfully with his hands against assailants, and Jehovah aids him. Benjamin is not a wolf that all day tears and devours: he is a favorite of Jehovah who lives in peace. Joseph is not a prince whose bow is in contest with the arrows of brothers: he is a prince victoriously combating foreign nations. Zebulun is not coolly mentioned as turned away from his people toward the sea and the Phœnician coast: he shall rejoice in his maritime toil. Issachar is not mocked at for his indolence and slavish submissiveness: he shall rejoice in the quiet tents to which he peaceably clings. Dan is not a serpent treacherously lurking by the way: he is a young lion, and if his murderous descent upon Laish is alluded to, it is done with gentleness. And the remaining three tribes—Gad, Naphtali, and Asher—are equally remembered with warm affection. The fierce expression in which Gad's praise for prowess is couched grates unpleasantly upon the ear in connection with the rest, but it is probably owing to a fresh remembrance of a furious grapple of that border tribe with a powerful invader.

The preceding comparison of the two poetical productions may also serve as an aid in estimating their respective claim to priority of age. That one of the two served as a model for the other, if not as a text

to be re-elaborated, is almost undeniable. Now, it is highly improbable that when the Blessing of Moses, overflowing with benign feeling and unmixed love for the whole nation, had been current in Israel, somebody should have thought it a profitable enterprise to distort it, under a new title, into a parody teeming with ill-disguised hate and calumny. Would not, in such a case, the mischief fall upon the head of him who thus, to speak with the psalmists, whets his tongue like a sword, and bends a treacherous bow to shoot arrows that are bitter words? On the other hand, if the insidious piece was composed and propagated first, it was but natural that a poetical mind free from the selfish interest and envy which inspired it should undertake the task of substituting for it, in the sacred literature of the nation, a work similar in conception and form but diametrically opposite in character, a poem fragrant with harmony and brotherly love. This leads us to an approximate determination of the time when the Blessing of Moses was composed. That of Jacob, as has been shown above,[47] cannot have been written before the time of Jeroboam; it may have been written during his reign, or not long after it, while the enmity between the houses of Joseph and Judah was still burning. The younger Blessing is clearly the product of an age in which, though the northern Hebrew kingdom still existed in its integ-

[47] IV., V.

rity, the fratricidal rivalry between it and the kingdom of Judah had subsided, at least to a degree; which, though Ephraim still envied Judah, and Judah still vexed Ephraim,[48] yet allowed the prophets of Jehovah, in both sections of Israel, to come forward with exhortations, remembrances of the past, and visions of the future calculated to allay sectional animosities, and rekindle the ancient flame of love between the divided brethren; in which also both kingdoms were successfully struggling with foreign nations, and a writer decidedly fond of the northern section might speak with admiration of Judah's contests and of the Levite priests attached to his sanctuary. Such a time was the period (before and after 800 B.C.) when Jeroboam II. reigned in Israel, and Uzziah in Judah, the one victoriously combating the Syrians, and reconquering all the territory east of the Jordan, and the other enlarging his kingdom toward the south; and when Amos and Hosea, while boldly denouncing apostasy from Jehovah and immorality in both kingdoms, also gave vent to their hope for the reunion of all the tribes under one head.[49] And it is this time to which Graf, Kuenen, Oort, and others assign the Blessing before us.[50] The style and tone

[48] *Cf.* Is. xi. 13.

[49] See Hos. ii. 2 (i. 11), and Am. ix. 11.

[50] The untenableness of many other suppositions has been fully demonstrated by Volck in his monograph, 'Der Segen Mose's untersucht und ausgelegt,' the negative portions of which—but only those

of the composition ; the allusion to the reduced condition of Reuben ; Simeon's cry of distress ;[51] the great importance attached to Levi—though part of the words concerning that tribe may be a later insertion, as may also be some referring to Joseph and repeated after Jacob—while at the same time sacrifices on a mountain outside of Jerusalem are still spoken of with praise ; the mention of Gad as fiercely fighting — probably with the Syrians—and of Zebulun and Naphtali, who were the first to be deported by the Assyrians, as still living in undisturbed peace — all this is in perfect accord with the circumstances of that period, as far as they are known to us, and there is hardly a point in the Blessing which conflicts with them.

Of the prophets of the period, which saw the dawn of a great age of Hebrew literature, neither Amos nor Hosea, judging by the character of their passionate utterances, may be presumed to have written the Blessing of Moses ; the one to whom its authorship might more rationally be ascribed is Jonah, the son of Amittai, of Gath-Hepher, who encouraged Jeroboam II. in his gallant struggle with the Syrians.[52]

—are generally both exhaustive and convincing. Knobel's opinion that the Blessing was produced in the reign of Saul, during the time when David was abroad, fleeing before that king, is based on the application to the Judæan fugitive of the words 'and bring him to his people,' an application shown above to be erroneous.

[51] Graetz, *l. c.*, has interesting remarks on the subject.

[52] See II. Kings xiv. 25.

XIII.

An unknown poet, probably of a very late age, reflecting on the glorious era in which Israel was formed into a nation, and under the lead of Moses and Joshua triumphantly carried across the Red Sea, the wilderness, and the Jordan, gave expression to his feelings of awe and adoration in the following brief psalm :

(Psalm CXIV.)

(1) When Israel departed from Egypt,
Jacob's house from a barbarously speaking people,
Judah became his[1] sacred estate,
Israel his dominion.
The sea saw, and fled,
the Jordan turned back ;
mountains skipped like rams,
hills like the young of the flock.
(5) What ails thee, O sea, that thou fleest ?
thee, O Jordan, that thou turnest back ?
you, O mountains, that ye skip like rams ?
you, O hills—like the young of the flock ?
Before the Lord tremble, O earth,
before Jacob's God,
who turns a rock into a water-pool,
a flint into a fountain of waters.

[1] *his*] God's. Ewald concludes from the omission that the psalm before us is a continuation of the one preceding it in the collection ; but, while the style is the same, the contents are different.

XIV.

If the words referring to the Jordan in the psalm just given are not a vague hyperbolical expression, but an allusion to the miraculous crossing of that river under the lead of Joshua, they contain the only mention of that extraordinary event to be found in the Hebrew Scriptures outside of the book which is devoted to the career of the conqueror of Canaan. No other song, no fragment, no prophetic utterance has been preserved—if any ever existed—containing the faintest allusion to that landmark in Israel's history, which in character and importance almost rivals the crossing of the Red Sea, if, as a piece of legendary story, it is not an imitation of it. The book of Joshua,[1] however, relates the affair with utmost minuteness of detail, such as we in vain look for in the description of the similar achievement of which Moses is the human hero. The main feature —which in regard to those poetical lines of the psalmist must here be stated—is this : When the Israelites, on the death of Moses, approached the river separating them from the land of promise, they found it swollen and overflowing its banks ; but, when the feet of the priests who bore the ark of the covenant before the people were dipped in the brim of the stream, the waters coming down from above

[1] iii., iv.

rose up and stood like a dike, and those flowing down toward the Dead Sea were cut off, so that the people crossed over dry-footed, opposite Jericho. Is this story, unmentioned in any other book or fragment, an invention of the writer, who is supposed by rational critics to have lived about nine hundred years after the time he speaks of—according to the biblical chronology—or did it live in the recollections of the people, in ballads now lost, long before his time? The silence of the other Scriptural books is no decisive argument in favor of the former supposition. Thus Miriam, for instance, a highly interesting character of the Pentateuch, is totally ignored in all other divisions of the Scriptures excepting a solitary mention in one word by Micah, which, however, at once reveals the fact that she was a legendary heroine[2] centuries before the narratives of Moses, his brother, and his sister became parts of the connected books which now embody them. Nor is it likely that any writer of a late period—that is of a period advanced in literary knowledge—should have dared to enlarge the records of the nation by recitals of extraordinary events for the reception of which his readers were not prepared by tradition. It is one thing to embellish, expand, and systematize hoary tradition, and thus give it new colors and a more venerable shape, a thing which ancient writers of national and sacred history have but too often done;

[2] See Mic. vi. 4.

another, to compose an independent romantic narrative, such as are the books of Jonah and Ruth, and give it the appearance of history ; and still another, to fabricate chapters of solemn history and coolly lay them down in the national archives.

Like the Pentateuch, the book of Joshua abounds with miracles, some told as such, and others disguised as natural occurrences : The Israelites having eaten of the fruit of the land of Canaan, the fall of manna, on which they had lived in the wilderness, ceased on the morrow. When Joshua was before Jericho, he beheld a man with a drawn sword standing over against him : it was a captain of the host of Jehovah. All of Israel's fighting men, six hundred thousand, marched in one day seven times around the wall of that beleaguered city. And when the priests blew the trumpets, and the people raised a great shout, the wall fell flat down, and Jericho was taken. When Achan stealthily carried off a part of the booty, he was discovered by the casting of sacred lots. Joshua having stretched his hand with his spear toward Ai, at the beginning of the final combat for that place, he drew it not back until his ambush had entered and burned the town, and his main force had routed the foe in the field, slain the combatants there or in the wilderness wherein they chased them, and, after returning, smitten all the inhabitants of Ai with the edge of the sword. When, after the great defeat at Gibeon, the confederate Canaanites fled down toward Beth-Horon, Jehovah cast down

great hail-stones from heaven upon them, which killed more of them than had fallen by the sword. And here comes the crowning miracle, which the author, as if afraid that it might seem surpassing belief, tells in part in the words of an ancient song, citing the authority. He tells it thus :

(Joshua X. 12–14.)

' Then Joshua thus spoke to Jehovah, . . .
and said in the sight of Israel,
" Stand still, O sun, over Gibeon,
and thou, O moon, over the vale of Ajalon." [3]
And the sun was still,
and the moon stood,
until the nation had its revenge on its foes.

Is not this written in the " Sepher hayyāshār " ? And the sun stood still in the midst of heaven, and hasted not to go down about a whole day. And there was no day like that before it or after it, that Jehovah hearkened to the voice of a man ; for Jehovah fought for Israel.'

The author of the poem evidently never thought of relating a cosmic revolution ; he meant to make Joshua tell his warriors, in powerfully figurative language, that there was still time to complete the destruction of the enemy ere sunset would put a stop to the pursuit ; and to add, in the same strain, that

[3] *Gibeon . . . Ajalon*] After the conquest, towns within the territories of Benjamin and Dan, respectively ; the latter to the west of the former. There are extensive speculations by commentators about the positions occupied at that moment by the sun, the moon,

as the heroic commander spoke so it was. It was the historian who, from a craving for the miraculous, turned the poet's history into fiction, and made God, after the murderous shower of hail-stones, suspend the laws of the universe for about a whole day, in order to give the exhausted Israelites sufficient time leisurely to pick up the fugitives. The historian, however, deserves our thanks for having saved from oblivion a precious morsel of very ancient Hebrew poetry. His quotation also shows that he took some facts of his history from national ballads, or from earlier narratives interspersed with songs. And, in reference to the day of Gibeon, the earlier legend, with or without the standing still of the sun, was also known to Isaiah, who, speaking of Jehovah as soon to rise again, says, 'As in the valley of Gibeon he will show his wrath, while doing his work, a work that is strange, and executing his labor, a labor unheard of.' [4]

Isaiah's allusion to strange work by Jehovah in the valley of Gibeon was uttered (about 710 B.C.) more than seven hundred years after the conquest of Canaan, if the biblical chronology is right, or about six centuries after it, if the historico-chronological view of most recent Egyptologists is to be preferred. Of how much earlier origin is the poetical fragment quoted in the book of Joshua? Unfortunately we

and Joshua, the hour of the day, and similar points—speculations which it is hardly worth while to reproduce here.

[4] Is. xxviii. 21.

possess only two quotations from the 'Sepher hayyāshār,' the one given above and David's elegy on the death of Saul and Jonathan,[5] similarly cited. That the collection contained that elegy proves only that it was not compiled before the accession of David—and it may have been compiled much later—but it decides nothing in regard to the respective ages of the songs it embraced. The title of the collection, strangely misnamed 'Book of Jasher,' in the English Authorized Version, is, according to the Hebrew as we have it, and also according to the Septuagint and the Vulgate,[6] 'Book of the Upright' (*man*, *men*, or *conduct* being understood). The songs were probably collected with the purpose of showing how upright men in Israel, among them heroes like Joshua and Jonathan, lived and died—shining examples for later generations; or how Israel—poetically also called Jeshurun, 'the upright'[7]—is blessed and protected by divine favor, and glorious through the righteousness and valor of his sons. The title was, however, differently read by the Syriac translator: 'Sepher hashshīr,' book of songs, instead of 'Sepher hayyāshār,'[8] and Herder and others consider his reading to have been the correct one.[9]

[5] II. Sam. i.

[6] The Septuagint has *βιβλίον τοῦ εὐθοῦς*; the Vulgate, 'liber justorum.'

[7] See above, XII., note 13.

[8] In Hebrew ספר השיר instead of ספר הישר.

[9] Bishop Lowth ('De Sacra Poesi Hebræorum,' lect. xxiii.) adds a conjecture of his own to the many made before him; his remarks are

Whether we prefer the one title or the other, we may presume the scope of the book to have been nearly as stated ; but the one form admits of its having been a work embracing both prose and poetry, while the other limits it to songs. In each case, however, its contents may have been used and abused to a great extent by the authors of the historical books of the Old Testament, and many a poem now incorporated in the latter, like the song of triumph on the crossing of the Red Sea or the Song of Deborah, may have been taken from it, though the source is not mentioned.

Thus there was an old song on the battle of Gibeon ; there probably existed others on the reduction of Jericho, the capture of Ai, and similar achievements during the conquest. The curse pronounced by Joshua over the man who should dare to rebuild Jericho,[10] and concluding with the words, ' On his first-born shall he found it, on his youngest son shall

substantially as follows : The Hebrews gave titles to their books from the initial word, or from some remarkable word in the first sentence ; thus Genesis is called ' B'rēshīth ' (' In the Beginning '), and Numbers ' B'midbar ' (' In the Wilderness '). We find also in their writings songs which had been produced on historical occasions introduced by some such forms as *āz yāshīr*, then sang (Moses, Ex. xv. 1) or *vattāshar*, and (she) sang (Deborah, Judg. v. 1). A more frequent form may have been *vayyāshar* (*vay-yāshar*), and (he) sang, and the book may have had its title ' Sepher hayyāshār,' (' Book of yāshār ') because itself and most of the songs began with that word.—This conjecture is, however, open to grammatical objections. Nor are the titles ' B'rēshīth,' ' B'midbar,' of ancient date.

[10] Josh. vi. 26.

he set up its gates,' may possibly be a fragment of a historical ballad. If it is, the ballad was probably written after the rebuilding of Jericho—in the reign of Ahab (about 900 B.C.)—by Hiel of Beth-El, who 'laid its foundation on Abiram, his first-born, and set up the gates on Segub, his youngest son,' as we read in I. Kings.[11] The author of Kings, it is true, adds that the death of the two sons took place 'according to the word of Jehovah which he spoke through Joshua, the son of Nun,' but he had his information—writing at least as late as about 560 B.C.[12]—either from the book of Joshua, if that be an earlier production than his own, or from its source. The legend of the curse naturally arose after the event: when Hiel's sons died at the rebuilding of Jericho, the people thought there must have been a curse on the stones of the ruined city, and, as usual, a writer—in verse or prose—was found who saw in the death of the children for the sin of the father an act of divine retribution, worthy to be commemorated. In the same spirit another writer commemorated[13] the stoning and burning, for a sacrilegious theft committed by Achan, of the culprit himself and 'his sons, and his daughters, and his oxen, and his asses, and his sheep'—an act of justice, we read, which was executed by Joshua according to

[11] xvi. 34.

[12] The concluding verses of II. Kings relate an event which took place in the thirty-seventh year of the captivity of Jehoiachin.

[13] See Josh. vii.

divine command, and had the effect that 'Jehovah turned from the fierceness of his anger.' The writer, however, who found it so easy to trace the death of Hiel's sons back to its remote superhuman cause seems to have been inadequately informed as to the historical course of events in his country; for Jericho, 'the city of palm trees,' as it is called both in Deuteronomy and Chronicles,[14] was not in ruins all the time between Joshua and Ahab, as he believed. Immediately after the death of the conqueror we find the Kenites marching 'from the city of palm trees with the children of Judah into the wilderness of Judah.'[15] Not many years afterward, Eglon, king of Moab, having defeated the Israelites, 'occupied the city of palm trees.'[16] And when David's envoys had been maltreated at the Ammonite court, he ordered them not to return immediately to his capital, but to 'tarry in Jericho.'[17] If the city was totally in ruins in the reign of Ahab, a century after David, it must have been owing to a comparatively recent destruction, possibly by an earthquake.

The mention of Joshua in Kings, in connection with the rebuilding of Jericho, and another, equally brief and incidental mention of him in Nehemiah[18]

[14] Deut. xxxiv. 3, II. Chr. xxviii. 15.

[15] Judg. i. 16.

[16] Judg. iii. 13.

[17] II. Sam. x. 5.

[18] viii. 17. Here, however, he is called Jeshua. The statement is this: 'All the congregation . . . made booths, and sat under

are, strange to say, the only mentions of him in the Scriptures outside of the book which bears his name and of the Pentateuch, that is, outside of what recent critics designate as the Hexateuch, and consider as a connected history in six parts. Shall we conclude from this surprising silence of the prophets, the psalmists, and so many other writers, to whom the earliest reminiscences of Israel must have been sacred, that the life of Joshua, as given in the Hexateuch, is a fiction? Such a conclusion would be rash. We have seen above that Miriam, though known to Micah in the eighth century B.C., is ignored in many books written after him. The name of King Solomon is not mentioned in a single prophetic utterance. Isaiah, one of the grandest figures in the history of Israel, is not alluded to by any other prophet. Isaiah, however—as we have seen—knew of the battle of Gibeon, though he never refers to its hero, just as Sisera, the Canaanitish captain who was vanquished by Deborah, is twice mentioned[19] in books which, with all others except Judges, are silent about the conqueress.

the booths ; for since the days of Jeshua, the son of Nun, to that day had the children of Israel not done so.' It is probable that 'Jeshua, the son of Nun,' stands here by mistake for ' Josiah, the son of Amon,' a king who restored or reformed the national festivals, and of whose celebration of the passover we read in II. Chr. xxxv. 18 : ' There was no passover like that kept in Israel from the days of Samuel the prophet ; neither did any of the kings of Israel keep such a passover as Josiah kept.'

[19] I. Sam. xii. 9, Ps. lxxxiii. 9.

On the other hand, we must not hastily attribute much evidential importance to single poetical fragments, or isolated poetical allusions by prophets and psalmists, in estimating the historical value of narratives overcharged with mythical ingredients. That an ancient ballad of uncertain date sang the battle of Gibeon, and Isaiah, in the eighth century B.C., also knew of it, does not prove that any of the particulars of that contest, as given in a miracle-loving history of very late date—as critics judge—are founded on a historical basis. The battle is not proved to have been fought in the fifteenth century, in which the so-called historical accounts place it, nor during the conquest of Canaan. Such fragments and allusions show only that the earliest history of Israel existed in vague outlines in popular traditions, long before the composition of the prose works which detail it with such minuteness. Nor is this minuteness of statement an evidence in favor of the authenticity of the relations. On the contrary, it impugns it very strongly ; for it generally coincides with the intrinsic incredibility of the story. The book of Joshua, now before us, amply justifies this assertion, and the books which follow it in the canon, though describing later events, do it as amply. To take single examples from Judges, Samuel, and Kings, is there any thing more minutely told in those books than the adventures of Samson, the meeting of Saul with the spirit of Samuel, or the career of Elijah, the mythical character of all of

which needs not to be proved? It is not within the scope of these pages to enter into a critical analysis of the book of Joshua, in order to show the relations to history of a brief poetical fragment contained in it; but it is not going out of our way to state that such analyses, executed by clear-sighted and diligently searching scholars, have reduced the historical value of that work—or part of a work—to a minimum. Hitzig, it must be owned, is not the most cool-headed of critics, but when he says of the last three-fifths of the book, 'that is all a romance, not history,'[20] he does not express the most unfavorable opinion of it. A Joshua may have led the Israelites across the Jordan, captured Jericho, achieved a victory at Gibeon, reduced most of Canaan, distributed the land, and thus have become the founder of a commonwealth; but the book which relates all this deserves, perhaps, no more credit than the stories of Livy about Romulus and the foundation of Rome. The rise of the Roman state is now generally believed to have been a work of slow natural growth, and such also may have been the rise of the Hebrew power in Palestine. Small hamlets on the border of Latium grew into a large conquering city by expansion and amalgamation, and small Hebrew and non-Hebrew populations probably grew by a similar process into the people ruled over by David. When, from which side or sides, and how those populations

[20] 'Geschichte des Volkes Israel,' vol. i. p. 103.

entered the country, cannot positively be established now by critical processes. The immigration may have been a very gradual one ; Ephraim, Manasseh, and other tribes may have come from the east, crossing the Jordan peacefully or in the face of enemies, and Judah and Simeon, with the Kenites and other non-Hebrews, from the south ; a Kenezite, Caleb, may have been a leader of the southern immigrants or conquerors, and an Ephraimite, Joshua, of those who came across the Jordan. The book of Joshua gives an epical account of the conquest of Canaan ; every thing centres in its hero, the servant of God. The mythical element in it is very strong, the historical is an unknown quantity.

XV.

The story of Deborah, as told in the fourth chapter of Judges, is this: After the death of Ehud, the Israelites were twenty years oppressed by Jabin, 'king of Canaan,' who reigned in Hazor (near the foot of Lebanon). His host, commanded by Sisera, included nine hundred iron chariots. At that time Deborah, a prophetess, the wife of Lapidoth, judged Israel (in more southern parts). She dwelt under a palm tree between Ramah and Beth-El, in the 'Mountains of Ephraim,' the children of Israel going up to her for judgment. And she sent for Barak, the son of Abinoam, who lived at Kedesh-in-Naphtali (near Jabin's capital), and told him, 'Jehovah, Israel's God, commands thee thus, "Go and draw toward Mount Tabor, taking with thee ten thousand men of the children of Naphtali and of Zebulun; and I will draw after thee, to the river Kishon, Sisera, the captain of Jabin's army, with his chariots and his multitude, and I will deliver him into thy hand."' And Barak said, 'If thou goest with me, I go.' 'I will surely go,' replied Deborah, 'and the glory of the journey shall not be thine: Jehovah will deliver Sisera into the hand of a woman.' She thereupon arose, and they went to Kedesh. Hither Barak called Zebulun and Naphtali, and, having assembled ten thousand men, marched

up with Deborah to Mount Tabor. Hearing of this, Sisera collected all his army and all his war-chariots, and followed to the river Kishon. Now Deborah told Barak to attack, and he descended from Tabor with the ten thousand. The discomfiture of the enemy was so complete that Sisera left his chariot and fled on foot. Barak pursued, and the fugitives were cut down to the last man. Sisera, fleeing to a place near Kedesh, sought refuge in the tent of Jael, the wife of Heber the Kenite, whose house, though claiming affinity with the posterity of Moses,[1] lived in peace with the king of Hazor. And Jael went out to meet Sisera, and encouraged him to enter, and, when he turned in, she covered him with a mantle. Weary and thirsty, he begged for a little water, but she gave him a bottle of milk to drink, and covered him. He was soon fast asleep. Jael then took a nail of the tent and a hammer, approached him softly, and struck the nail into his temples, and he died. And the hand of Israel continued to prevail against Jabin, until he was utterly destroyed.

'On that day, Deborah and Barak sang this song:

(Judges V.)

(2) When princes lead in Israel,
when the people nobly rise,
praise ye Jehovah.

[1] See above, XI., note 22.

Hear, kings ;
listen, rulers :
to Jehovah I,
to him *I* sing ;
I chant to Jehovah,
Israel's God.

O Jehovah, at thy coming from Seir,
at thy marching from Edom's field,[2]
the earth trembled,
and the heavens dropped,
the clouds dropped water ;
(5) the mountains melted
before Jehovah,
Sinai yonder
before Jehovah,
Israel's God.

In the days of Shamgar, Anath's son,[3]
in the days of Jael,[4]

[2] See above, XII., note 7.

[3] A judge of Israel, after Ehud, who defeated the Philistines, in the south of the country, while the north submitted to Jabin. See Judg. iii. 31.

[4] 'The association of Jael with Shamgar suggests the idea that reference is made to some unrecorded judge of that name, probably the successor of Shamgar, and whose public authority might be of equally brief duration. The presumption that this is the true interpretation, rather than that the reference is to the wife of Heber the Kenite, is strengthened by the fact that the name of this person is introduced by the formula "in the days of," which is commonly applied to men invested with public authority' (Jamieson). This is the view taken by Gesenius, Bertheau, Fürst, and others. Cassel supposes that Jael is the popular surname of Shamgar, or of Ehud ; if there had been

the roads were deserted ;
high-way travellers
walked on winding paths.
Deserted were Israel's fields,
deserted,
until I, Deborah, arose,
arose a mother in Israel.
New gods were chosen—
so war was at the gates ;
was there seen a shield, a spear,
among forty thousand in Israel ?
My heart is with Israel's leaders,
the willing champions of the people—
praise ye Jehovah.

(10) Ye who ride on white-dappled asses,
ye who sit on garments,
and ye who walk on roads,
speak.[5]
Louder than herd-drivers shout
between water-troughs,
let men sing there
the victories[6] of Jehovah,
his victories in Israel's fields,

another judge of that name, he would be recorded, as briefly, at least, as Elon or Abdon. It is, however, quite in the rôle of Deborah to speak of the 'woman' Jael as of a person marking an epoch.

[5] *Ye who ride . . . speak*] All—high and low, rich and poor—should speak out loudly their thanks for the deliverance.

[6] *Victories*] 'Machtthaten,' E. Meier ('Geschichte der poetischen National-Literatur der Hebräer'). See above, XII., note 26, and note G, at the end of the volume.

when down came to the gates
the people of Jehovah.
Awake, awake, Deborah;
awake, awake,
utter a song;
arise, Barak;
carry off thy captives,
O son of Abinoam.
Down came there a remnant
of the people's nobles—
Jehovah descending with me
among the heroes—[7]
men from Ephraim,
whose root is in Amalek,[8]

[7] *Down . . . heroes*] Thus according to the Masoretic division and punctuation—supposing that *y'rad* may mean the same as *yārad*, which Ewald ('Lehrbuch,' §§ 87, 119, 226) hesitatingly admits, and Olshausen ('Lehrbuch,' § 232) denies. A slight deviation from the Masoretic reading, however, would change the translation into the following: Down came there a remnant of the nobles, the people of Jehovah came down to me with the heroes. Meier translates accordingly,

'Da kam ein Rest
Von Edlen herab,
Das Volk des Herrn kam zu mir
Mit den Helden.'

The rendering of the Authorized Version and similar renderings are based on the view that *y'rad* is not the indicative past or imperative (Gesenius) of the verb *yārad*, to descend, but the indicative past of *rādāh*, to subdue, to dominate.

[8] 'Amalek' is believed to be here equivalent to 'the mountain of the Amalekite,' mentioned in Judg. xii. 15 as a part of the land of Ephraim.

behind thee, Benjamin,
with thy hosts ;
from Machir[9]
leaders came ;
from Zebulun,
men wielding a commander's staff ;[10]
(15) the princes of Issachar
with Deborah ;
and as Issachar so Barak
descended to the valley on foot.
By the brooks of Reuben
minds meditated grandly—
why sattest thou between the sheepfolds,
listening to the piping by the flocks ?
By the brooks of Reuben
minds speculated grandly.
Gilead [11] stayed beyond Jordan,
and Dan—why did he dwell on ships ?
Asher remained on the sea-shore,
abode by his inlets.
Zebulun is the people
that threw away life to death ;
Naphtali, too—
on the heights of the field.

[9] *Machir*] ' The first-born of Manasseh, the father of Gilead ' (Josh. xvii. 1). The name stands here for all Manasseh, or for a main division of that tribe.

[10] *a commander's staff*] The rendering of Gesenius, Fürst, and others.

[11] The Septuagint has ' Gad,' which is more likely to be correct.

Kings came, and combated :
the kings of Canaan fought ;
at Taanach,
by Megiddo's waters—[12]
no ransom-money
would they take.
(20) From heaven came combatants ;
the stars, from their courses,
fought against Sisera ;
Kishon's stream swept them away,
that battle-brook,[13]
Kishon's stream—
march on, O my soul, in triumph !
There clattered hoofs of steeds,
the champions dashing on, dashing.
' Curse ye Meroz,' [14]

[12] *Taanach . . . Megiddo*] Places within the territory of Issachar, but assigned to Manasseh (Josh. xvii. 11) ; now Taanukh and Lejjun, on the south border of the plain of Jezreel, which is traversed by the Kishon.

[13] *battle brook*] Literally *brook of encountering*, in Hebrew *q'dūmīm*, a n. pl., formed like *'ănūtīm, n'dūdīm, 'ăshūqīm, 'ăçūmīm, g'ūlīm, hăthullīm, m'ruqīm. Qiddēm*, in the sense of *hostilely advancing against*, occurs in II. Sam. xxii. 19, and Ps. xviii. 19 (18) (' They met me on a day of disaster '), II. Kings xix. 32 and Is. xxxvii. 33 (' nor come before it with a shield '), Job xxx. 27, and elsewhere. The banks of the Kishon may have been famous as a scene of terrible fighting from the time of the Egyptian king Thothmes III. (See below.)

[14] A place mentioned nowhere else in Scriptures. Various attempts have been made to identify it with similarly named localities spoken of by Jerome, Eusebius, or modern travellers. Ewald (' History of

says Jehovah's messenger ;
' curse, curse its inhabitants ;
for they came not
to fight by Jehovah,
to fight by Jehovah
among the heroes.'
Blessed above women be Jael,
the wife of Heber, the Kenite—
blessed above women in tents.
(25) He asked for water,
milk she gave ;
in a lordly bowl
she brought forth cream.
She grasped a nail with one hand,
with her right hand the workmen's hammer,
and struck Sisera,
battered his head,
and crushed and smashed his temples.
At her feet he bent,
and sank, and lay ;
at her feet he bent and sank :
where he bent,
there he fell—destroyed.
Through the window looks,
lamenting,
the mother of Sisera—
through the lattice :

Israel,' vol. ii. p. 377) is justly inclined to consider *Meroz* a corruption of *Meron*, the name of a place closely connected in Josh. xii. 19-22 with ' Hazor,' ' Taanach,' ' Megiddo,' and ' Kedesh.'

'Why lingers his car in coming?
why tarry the wheels of his chariots?'
The wise among her ladies answer,
even she replies to herself:
(30) 'Do they not find and divide booty?
A vulture-ornament or two[15]
for each hero's head;
spoils of divers dyes for Sisera,
spoils dyed and embroidered;
two robes dyed and embroidered,
from the necks of the captured.'[16]
Thus may perish
all thy foes, O Jehovah.
They who love him
are like the sun rising in its strength.

[15] Literally, *a vulture, two vultures;* in Hebrew, *ra'ham ra'hămāthayim*. These two nouns, masc. and fem. respectively, are more or less fully identical with *rā'hām* (Lev. xi. 18) and *rā'hāmāh* (Deut. xiv. 17), rendered *gier eagle* in the Authorized Version, and *Aasgeier* by Gesenius. The Masoretic punctuation may be wrong. Vultures of precious metal were probably ornaments of commanders' helmets. This explanation of the text, which removes from the noble song the reproach of vulgarity, was many years ago orally communicated to the writer by Rapoport, in Prague. Its correctness is fully established by the following words of the verse which connect *ra'ham ra'hămāthayim* with 'head,' and *çeba' riqmāthayim* with 'neck.'

[16] *necks of the captured*] This refers, perhaps, to animals; *cf.* Judg. viii. 26, where 'chains on the necks of camels' form a part of the capture (*shālāl*). The Septuagint read, instead of *l'çavv'rē*, for (or from) the necks of, *l'çavvārō*, for his neck, which changes the meaning of the line into the following: *for his* (Sisera's) *neck, (his) capture.*

The contents of the biblical story and the song combined can easily be recast into a chapter of history in modern style. And it has been done, of course with the license customary in such work. Oort, for instance, thus depicts the conditions under which the bloody conflict arose :[17] 'The plain of Jezreel, then, formed a kind of boundary between the country over which the Canaanites still held sway and that of which the Israelites had become the masters. On the plain itself[18] certain wandering tribes of shepherds pitched their tents. They were Kenites, and had perhaps penetrated to their present position from the south. But though they had gained an entrance into Canaan by the aid of the Judæans and other Israelites, they were not on good terms with the kinsmen of their former allies, but took the side of the Canaanites. . . . The great highway from Syria to Egypt ran through the plain of Jezreel, and whoever held possession of it was, therefore, master of all the commerce of the country, had the whole seaboard, more or less, in his power, and could lay imposts upon all kinds of merchandise. Jabin made ample use of these powers. The result was that commerce was brought almost to a standstill, and it was not long before the consequences

[17] 'The Bible for Young People,' part i., book ii., ch. xv.

[18] Oort supposes the Kedesh near which the house of Heber the Kenite pitched its tents (Judg. iv. 11), and where Barak lived (iv. 6), not to have been Kedesh-in-Naphtali, though distinctly so designated in connection with Barak, but a place on or near Mount Tabor.

made themselves felt even south of the plain. The roads were deserted, and everything languished. . . . The flocks were plundered, and the Israelite husbandman never knew whether he would be allowed to carry home the harvest that he saw ripening on his land. But woe to him if he resisted the tyrants! He was a child of death. Young men and girls were carried off as slaves. No one dared to resist the plunderers. And still they kept advancing. Who should deliver their victims? In the south, Shamgar, who fought against the Philistines, was still living, and a certain Jael, of whom we know nothing more, enjoyed great fame. But perhaps they felt no concern for "the sons of Issachar and of Joseph." . . . Be this as it may, they did not deliver the people. Where must they look for help? The Asherites were powerful indeed, but like the sons of Dan they were too busy with their shipbuilding, their fisheries, and their commerce to give heed to the sighs of the down-trodden. Often did the victims gaze across the Jordan wistfully, for there too their brethren dwelt. Had they not heard over there of their distress? They had, indeed; and when the bold shepherds of Reuben sat together in the evening on the banks of their streams they often spoke of the weary days passed by their brothers on the other side of the Jordan. . . . And yet how could they help them? All hands were needed for the work at home, all weapons to ward off beasts of prey and robber bands. Well! they

would consult the men of Gilead. They would—do a hundred things ; but they *did* nothing. . . . Help was to come from the south. . . .'

And the heroine who was to bring it and her surroundings are thus historico-romantically sketched by Dean Stanley :[19] ' On the heights of Ephraim, on the central thoroughfare of Palestine, near the sanctuary of Bethel, stood two famous trees (if we may be permitted to distinguish them), both in after-times known by the same name. One was the " oak tree" or " terebinth," " of Deborah," underneath which was buried, with many tears, the nurse of Jacob.[20] The other was a solitary palm, which, in all probability, had given its name to an adjacent sanctuary, Baal-Tamar,[21] " the sanctuary of the palm," but which was also known in after-times as " the palm-tree of Deborah."[22] Under this palm, as Saul afterwards under the pomegranate tree of Migron, as S. Louis under the oak-tree of Vincennes, dwelt Deborah, the wife of Lapidoth, to whom the sons of Israel came up to receive her wise answers. She is the magnificent impersonation of the free spirit of the Jewish people and of Jewish life. On the coins

[19] ' Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church,' lect. xiv.

[20] ' Gen. xxxv. 8, and possibly " the oak of Tabor," I. Sam. x. 3.'

[21] ' Judg. xx. 33.'

[22] ' Her name, on which Josephus (*Ant.* v. 5) lays stress as the Sacred Bee or " Queen Bee" of Palestine, may be perhaps derived from her patriarchal namesake, by whose tomb she sat. Compare Donaldson's Latin Dissertation on the Song of Deborah.'

of the Roman Empire, Judæa is represented as a woman seated under a palm-tree, captive and weeping. It is the contrast of that figure which will best place before us the character and call of Deborah. It is the same Judæan palm, under whose shadow she sits, but not with downcast eyes and folded hands, and extinguished hopes; with all the fire of faith and energy, eager for the battle, confident of the victory. Like the German prophetess who roused her people against the invaders from Rome, like the simple peasant-girl, who by communing with mysterious angels' voices, roused the French nation against the English dominion, when princes and statesmen had wellnigh given up the cause,—so the heads of Israel "ceased and ceased,[23] until that she, Deborah, arose, that she arose a mother in Israel." Her appearance was like a new epoch. . . . It was she who turned her eyes and the eyes of the nation to the fitting leader. . . . From his native place she summoned him to her side, and delivered to him her prophetic command.' In a similar, and still more poetical strain is Deborah introduced in Graetz's 'History.' [24]

[23] Stanley's rendering of Judg. v. 7 differs from ours.

[24] Vol. i. p. 111: 'eine starke Frau, stark nicht durch mannweibische Blutthaten, nicht durch das Blendwerk mystischer Berufung, sondern durch das sanfte Säuseln dichterischer Gehobenheit. . . . Lieder sang sie, aber nicht zu müssigem Spiele, sondern mit so hinreissender Begeisterung und so gewaltiger Kraft, dass sie Feiglinge in Helden zu verwandeln vermochte. Debora war eine Dichterin, und die Begabung der Poesie war in ihrem Busen zur prophetischen Vorschau gesteigert. . . .' All this notwithstanding, Graetz, as

Kuenen[25] speaks more seriously of her position in the religious history of her people, as developed in the song: 'In this poem we are struck with the combination of the political with the religious element. Deborah denounces the tribes which had withdrawn from the war against Jabin, and praises to the skies the valiant men of Zebulun, Issachar, etc., who had responded to the call of Barak. Ardent love for her nation inspires her, and even justifies in her eyes the treacherous murder of Sisera, Jabin's captain, by Jael. While giving utterance to these opinions, she at the same time shows herself an upholder of the worship of Yahveh. In her mind Yahveh and Israel are inseparably connected. May "all enemies of Yahveh"—so she wishes—"perish like Sisera"! Whoever takes part in the conflict with Jabin "comes to the help of Yahveh." The victory obtained is one of the "righteous acts of Yahveh." When the distress had become so great, Yahveh, amid a signal display of his might, had gone forth —out of Seir, the land of Edom, his former and proper abode—into Canaan, where his people now dwelt, in order to fight for that people. So speaks Deborah. Of other gods than Yahveh she makes no mention. What is there then to prevent us from seeing in her a follower of Moses? . . . Tradition may commit an anachronism—as we have already shown

we shall see, does not believe in Deborah's authorship of the song generally designated after her.

[25] 'The Religion of Israel,' vol. i. pp. 313, 314.

to be probable—in calling Deborah "a prophetess," but in its estimate of her attitude towards the worship of Yahveh it is not mistaken.'

And the account of her brief campaign is thus ably modernized in Hitzig's 'History': [26] Barak having accepted her summons, 'she first accompanied him toward Kedesh, and here Zebulun and Naphtali were called to arms. The volunteer detachments were to gather outside of the enemy's sphere of power, and points of contact with the brethren in the south, especially with Issachar, to be gained. Barak, therefore, occupied the position on Tabor, a mountain in the northernmost branch of the plain of Jezreel. And the iron attracted the man: Sisera moved with horse and chariot to the brook Kishon. That he also crossed it, and advanced to the edge of the mountain range, was done probably with the intention to encircle the insurgent territory and, turning back northward, close the net. But to the south of that range another Israelitish army had gathered, consisting of warriors from Manasseh, Ephraim, and even Benjamin; and while this attacked in front, Barak with his hosts, descended from Tabor, and fell upon the enemy's rear. On the Kishon's left bank . . . the contest had begun; Barak's assault made it a victory for Israel. The hostile army suffered a total defeat; many of the fugitives were drowned in the river, which, always

[26] 'Geschichte des Volkes Israel,' vol. i. pp. 112, 113.

most dangerous to cross on account of drift-sand, was then swollen by rain (Judg. v. 20); the commander himself, continuing his flight on foot, was lured by a Kenitess into her tent, and there slain.'

But is all this history? Is the account given in the fourth chapter of Judges a strictly historical account, and the song following it a strictly historical poem? The authenticity of the former is greatly impaired by another account of the downfall and destruction of the kingdom of Hazor which we find in Joshua,[27] and which badly conflicts with the narrative before us. According to it, Jabin, king of Hazor—the names are given exactly as we have them in the story of Deborah—formed a powerful confederacy against Joshua in the north and centre of Canaan. A large number of kings took part in it. And they marched out with their hosts, with horses and chariots, and pitched their camps at the waters of Merom,[28] to fight against Israel. Here Joshua, with all his men of war, suddenly fell upon them, routed them, and pursued them in various directions, until all were destroyed. 'Joshua then turned back, and took Hazor, and smote its king with the sword: for Hazor was formerly the head of all those kingdoms; and they smote all the souls in it with the edge of the sword, utterly destroying them; not a soul was left; and he burned Hazor with fire.' The king of Hazor is also mentioned, with his con-

[27] xi. 1–14.

[28] Merom is mentioned nowhere else in Scriptures.

federates, in the list of the thirty-one kings destroyed by Joshua and the children of Israel, west of the Jordan.[29] The two narratives are evidently conflicting accounts of one and the same affair, as there is no likelihood that, a few generations after the total destruction of Hazor and its people, another Jabin, reigning at Hazor, should have been so powerful as to be called 'king of Canaan.' The statement, too, that 'Hazor was *formerly* the head of all those kingdoms' clearly shows that the writer of the narrative in Joshua knew only of its having held such a position before the battle at the waters of Merom.

Of course, the account of the fall of Hazor in Joshua is not in itself sufficient to destroy the authenticity of the version given in Judges. On the contrary, were we forced to consider one of the two as correct, we would give our preference to the latter, and that for more than one reason. First, it is a more common practice among writers of national history with whom the glorification of the past is a main object to antedate than to postdate events; if Joshua had figured in ancient traditions as the conqueror of Jabin and the destroyer of Hazor, no writer would have stripped him of his laurels and assigned the victory, which virtually decided the conquest of Canaan, to a later generation. Secondly, it is, historically considered, more probable that the conquest of

[29] Josh. xii. 7 *et seq.*

that country by the Israelites, or the establishment of their predominance in it, was the work of many successive struggles than that it was achieved by a few military feats under one commander ; nor is there any lack of evidence in favor of this view in the Scriptural narratives. Thirdly, the account given in Judges has the support of the grand poem attached to it.

It is true, outside of this poem there is nothing that could persuade us to accept the story of Deborah's victory and Sisera's tragic fate as a piece of history, joined, as it is, in the same book to a number of other stories more or less fabulous on their face. What precedes it is the brief mention of 'Shamgar, the son of Anath, who slew of the Philistines six hundred men with an ox-goad,' and what follows it is the long account of the victory achieved by Gideon and his three hundred over 'Midianites, Amalekites, and the children of the East . . . as numerous as locusts, with camels as countless as the sand on the sea-shore'—a victory previously announced by an angel of Jehovah, who had to prove the truth of his words by extraordinary miracles. And this again is followed by the adventures of Gideon's son Abimelech, who slaughtered his brothers, sixty-nine out of seventy, on one stone, and finally perished, like Sisera, by the hand of a woman. Besides, some of the names in the relation before us have a somewhat mythical sound : Deborah's fellow-commander is called Barak, which sig-

nifies *lightning;* her husband is Lapidoth, which signifies *torches;* and her own name, though generally rendered *bee*, may be translated *guide* or *leader.*[30] It is from the song alone that this narrative of the book of Judges receives a look of authenticity which most of the recitals of the same work sadly lack.

But is the song the production of a poetess or poet who witnessed the events sung, or who at least heard the details from the lips of patriots who fought by the waters of Megiddo? The answer of critics, old and recent, conservative and destructive, is overwhelmingly affirmative. Kuenen we have heard; Bernstein[31] sees in the Deborah-song 'a literary production, the ground-text of which—there is no doubt whatever—was composed very shortly after the victory over Sisera (1330 before our era), and preserved not only orally but in writing;' Hitzig [32] has no hesitation in ascribing it to the heroine herself. Others go further: Meier[33] sees no objection to the statement, apparently expressed in the introductory sentence, that Deborah herself sang her song at the celebration of the victory, and Barak

[30] According to Ewald ('History of Israel,' vol. ii. p. 375), it 'is thus used even by Deborah herself in her song, v. 7. Hence we perceive,' he adds, 'that the personal name of this heroic woman has been lost, in favor of the honorable appellation applied to her by the nation.'

[31] 'Ursprung der Sagen von Abraham, Isaak, und Jacob,' p. 84.

[32] 'Geschichte des Volkes Israel,' vol. i. p. 112.

[33] 'Geschichte der poetischen National-Literatur der Hebräer,' p. 87.

accompanied her on an instrument; Bertheau [34] thinks the conqueress improvised her verses during the triumphal procession. 'Only an eye-witness,' Meier remarks, 'only one who ardently partook in the struggle for freedom, could draw such a picture of it; every thing breathes immediate presence, individual life, and historically true bases. To which add that Deborah appears herself in the song, as the leading spirit in the great event, as its divinely animated originator. She speaks of herself in the first person, and that in a way which makes every one feel that none else could easily have spoken and sung thus in her name.' And then, the historical ground-work of the song shows great antiquity. No anachronism betrays a late origin. The actors and the environments are all accurately drawn. Nothing is forgotten: if Judah and Simeon are not mentioned among the tribes, the reason is easily discovered in their simultaneous struggles with the Philistines, under Shamgar or others. The concluding verse, which sounds like a reflection of a more religious age, may have been added by a pious redactor.

The arguments adverse to this view of the song, however, are manifold and weighty. In the first place, there is no sufficient reason for assuming that Deborah composed it in the circumstance of her appearing in it speaking in the first person: the

[34] *In loco.*

poet who chose her as his subject thus introduced her, to heighten the effect, or, perhaps, to create an illusion. Nor is it certain that she thus appears there: Graetz, as undaunted a believer in Deborah as there is, finds the notion absurd; *shaqqamtī*, he says,[35] stands, in poetical form, for *shaqqamt*, and the verse which contains it is to be rendered *until thou arosest, Deborah, arosest a mother in Israel*, not 'until I, Deborah, arose,' etc. This critical opinion can hardly be gainsaid from a grammatical point of view;[36] and is not Deborah also addressed in the poem in the second person, 'Awake, awake, Deborah; . . . utter a song'? *Sha* in *shaqqamtī*, which replaces the word *ăsher*, is a prefix very frequently used in late Hebrew (mostly in the form *she*), and is not to be found in a single book, or portion of a book, generally assigned by critics to an age preceding the Babylonian captivity. And this is not the only Aramaism discoverable in the song. What militates with greater strength against the authenticity of the latter is its having been unknown, at least in its connection with Jabin, to the author of Joshua, who, as we have seen, has an entirely different story to tell about the fall of Hazor, its king, and its allies. And a still stronger argument can be drawn from

[35] *L. c.*

[36] The first verse of Lamentations alone has two perfectly analogous poetical forms: *rabbāthī* and *sārāthī*; Is. i. 21 has *m'lēăthī*; Hos. x. 11, *ōhabtī*. Examples like *ōs'rī* (Gen. xlix. 11) are very numerous.

the diction, the form, and the moral tenor of the whole song. Is it likely that a poem so exquisitely worded, so beautifully and symmetrically versified, so thoroughly pervaded by lofty religious sentiments and ardent patriotism, was composed and faithfully preserved in an age—the period of the judges—of which there is no real history and no other literary remnant whatever? The heroes of Israel in those days—if we strip the stories about them of the supernatural and strain ourselves to save the possible—are strange Israelitish heroes indeed. Gideon is reared a worshipper of Baal, orders his boy to slay captives, erects an 'ephod' which becomes an idol, and at his death leaves seventy sons by his lawful wives alone.[37] Abimelech slaughters his seventy brothers, save one.[38] Jephthah sacrifices his daughter—whatever that may mean—in fulfilment of a vow.[39] Samson, a Nazarite, spends his life in loving Philistine women and wantonly killing Philistine men.[40] The Danite conquerors of Laish steal an idol, carry off its Levite priest, and establish its worship in their tribe.[41] The heroes of Benjamin fall in defending the perpetrators of the most horrid of crimes.[42] Is it likely that an age thus characterized in tradi-

[37] Judg. vi.–viii.
[38] Judg. ix. 5.
[39] Judg. xi.
[40] Judg. xiv.–xvi.
[41] Judg. xviii.
[42] Judg. xix., xx.

tion produced one of the noblest, if not the most perfect, of Hebrew lyrics? Is not this more probably the work of a late writer, who clothed a subject of ancient lore in an antique garb admirably woven?

And may not the legend of the ancient battle of Megiddo, with the song, have arisen out of mixed Israelitish and Egyptian war reminiscences, of which the Egyptian, kept alive in northern Palestine by commemorative stones or by Phœnician chronicles, referred to the great victory of Thothmes III. on that battle-field? It was at Megiddo, as monuments attest, that Thothmes, long before the time assigned to Deborah, defeated a powerful Syrian king with his confederates, capturing nine hundred and twenty-four war chariots.[43] This number strikingly reminds one of the nine hundred war chariots of King Jabin. And there are other points of resemblance between the two accounts: The king vanquished by the Egyptians was a king of Kadeshu, presumed by Egyptologists to designate a town on the Orontes: Jabin's capital was near Kedesh; the former assembled against Thothmes all the kings between Egypt and Mesopotamia: 'the kings of Canaan' fought for the latter; Taanach, as well as Megiddo, is named in both accounts.[44]

[43] See Brugsch, 'Geschichte Aegyptens,' pp. 294–303; Duncker, 'Geschichte des Alterthums,' vol. i. (fifth ed.), p. 123; and 'Egypt' in the 'Encyclopædia Britannica' (ninth ed.), vol. vii. p. 738.

[44] See note H, at the end of the volume.

XVI.

The story of Samson, the Nazarite, called one of the judges of Israel,[1] embraces a few poetical lines, which may be remnants of a song or songs on the wonderful exploits of that hero, or only proverbial sayings artfully connected in the narrative with some particulars of his legend.

The exploits are twelve in number. The first was this: Samson saw a Philistine woman in Timnathah (or Timnah),[2] who pleased him so well that he persuaded his father and mother to get her for him to wife. And they went down with him to Timnathah. When they came to the vineyards of the place, behold, a young lion roared against him. But the spirit of Jehovah came over him, and he rent the lion as he would have rent a kid, though he had nothing in his hand. This exploit he kept secret. He saw the woman, and the marriage was agreed upon. Returning to take her after a time, he went aside to see the carcass of the lion, and, behold, there was a swarm of bees and honey in it. He took some of the honey, and went on eating. According to custom, Samson arranged a wedding feast, and the Philistines brought thirty companions to be with him. Samson now offered to propound a riddle on

[1] Judg. xiii.–xvi.

[2] A town of Dan, generally held by the Philistines.

these conditions: if his companions succeeded in solving it within the seven days of the feast, he would give them thirty fine shirts and thirty changes of garments; if not, they should give the same things to him. They accepted. The riddle was this:

(Judges XIV. 14.)
Out of the eater came meat,
Out of the fierce came sweetness.

The Philistines tried long to find the solution, but in vain. They then[3] induced Samson's wife by threats to entice him into betraying the explanation, and he yielded to her tears. And before the sun of the seventh day went down they said to him:

(XIV, 18.)
'What is sweeter than honey?
what fiercer than a lion?'

And he said to them:

(XIV. 18.)
'Had ye not plowed with my heifer,
ye had not found my riddle.'

[3] *then*] On the *fourth* day, as given in the Septuagint, not on the *seventh*, as the Hebrew text has it by an obvious mistake, *sh'bī'ī* standing for *r'bī'ī*. See the context (Judg. xiv. 14–18): 'And they could not *in three days* declare the riddle. And on the seventh [fourth] day they said to Samson's wife, "Entice thy husband. . . ." And Samson's wife wept before him, and said, "Thou but hatest me, thou lovest me not." . . . And she wept before him *the* [rest of the] *seven days*, while their feast lasted, and *on the seventh day* he told her. . . . And she told the riddle to the children of her people.'

And the spirit of Jehovah came over him, and he went down to Ashkelon, slew thirty Philistines, took their spoils, and with them paid his debt to the expounders of his riddle. This was his second exploit. In his anger he returned to his father's house. While he was there his wife was given by her father to one of the Philistine companions, and when Samson returned to her with a present in the time of the wheat harvest, he was not allowed to enter her chamber. This insult he revenged by the following exploit, his third: he caught three hundred foxes, turned tail to tail, put a firebrand between every two tails, set the brands on fire, and let the foxes run into the standing corn, the shocks, the vineyards, and the olive gardens of the Philistines. The Philistines wreaked their revenge on his wife and father-in-law, whom they accused of having outraged Samson, but he, in his turn, chastised them by a great slaughter, his fourth exploit. He then went down (to the south), and dwelt in the cleft of a rock called Etam. The Philistines invaded Judah, and demanded the surrender of Samson. And three thousand men of Judah went to the rock, and told him that they had come to bind him, and deliver him to the Philistines. And Samson said, 'Swear to me that ye will not fall upon me yourselves.' This they promised, whereupon he allowed himself to be bound with two new cords, and was carried to the Philistines, who shouted when they beheld him. But now the spirit of Jehovah came over him, and the cords on his arms be-

came as kindled flax, and his bands dropped off. This was his fifth exploit, which was immediately followed by the sixth. He found a jawbone of an ass, grasped it, and slew with it a thousand of the enemy. And he said :

(XV. 16.)

'With the jawbone of an ass a mass, more than one mass—
with the jawbone of an ass I have slain a thousand men.'

Having thus spoken, he threw away the jawbone, and the place was hence called Ramath-Lehi (Jawbone-Height). The seventh exploit was an achievement by prayer. After his victory he became exceedingly thirsty, and he called to Jehovah, saying, 'Thou hast given this great deliverance into the hand of thy servant : shall I now die for thirst, and fall into the hands of the uncircumcised?' And God cleft the hollow that is at Lehi, so that water came out of it, and when Samson drank his spirit revived ; the spring was thence called En-Hakkore (Caller's Spring).[4] The eighth exploit shows the Naz-

[4] 'From the throwing away of the jawbone the place Lehi, as also the neighboring place Ramath-Lehi (Lehi Height) derives its name ; and the likewise neighboring Makhtesh (the Lehi Hollow more distinctively named En-Hakkore) was so called because God there, at the supplication of the hero, dying with thirst after such severe exertion, opened a refreshing spring of water—mere explanations of local names like those in the legends of the patriarchs' (Ewald, 'History of Israel,' vol. ii. p. 406). As *haqqōrē* signifies not only *the caller*, but also *the partridge*, the original name of the spring at Lehi was probably Partridge Spring, and the new explanation chosen for the sake of the Samson legend.

arite's gigantic bodily strength. He was one night in Gaza, at the house of a harlot. The Gazites laid wait for him in the gate of the city, expecting to kill him in the morning. But Samson arose at midnight, grasped the doors of the city gate and the two posts, removed them bar and all, put them upon his shoulders, and carried them to the top of a hill before Hebron. The ninth, tenth, and eleventh of Samson's exploits are connected with his love for a false mistress, Delilah, and her attempts, at the instigation of the Philistine princes, to deliver him powerless into their hands. Each time his strength saved him at the last moment. But she continued her efforts to ensnare him, saying to him, 'How canst thou say, "I love thee," when thy heart is not with me? These three times thou hast mocked me, and thou hast not told me in what thy great strength lies.' And as she pressed him to death, he told her all his heart. 'No razor,' he said, 'has come over my head; for I have been a Nazarite to God from my mother's womb: if I were shaved, my strength would leave me; I would become weak, and be like any other man.' Now Delilah, after informing the Philistine princes that this time his ruin was certain, made him fall asleep on her knees, and had the seven locks of his head shaved off. His enemies were there, and his strength was gone. The Philistines took him, put out his eyes, carried him to Gaza, bound him with brazen fetters, and made him grind in the prison house. His last exploit was the

last act of his life. The princes of the Philistines had effected a great gathering in the temple of Dagon, to offer sacrifices to that god, and to rejoice; for they said, 'Our god has delivered Samson, our enemy, into our hands.' When their hearts were merry, they had Samson brought from the prison, to make them sport. They placed him between the two middle pillars of the temple, which was full of men and women, three thousand standing on the roof to look on. Now Samson, whose hair had begun to grow again, prayed to Jehovah for vengeance, and taking hold with his hands of the two middle pillars, on which the temple rested, and exclaiming, 'Let me die with the Philistines,' bent with all his might, and the temple fell, burying all within it in its ruins.

The striking resemblance which the career and character of Samson, in spite of the thin Israelitish varnish put upon them, bear to the career and character of the Grecian Hercules has been the theme of many a writer. Marvellous strength, a roving disposition, readiness to fight men and beasts, submissiveness toward women, and a grotesque trait of honesty are common to both. Each performs twelve exploits. The first of these, in both legends, is the killing of a lion. The Nemean lion is strangled by Hercules: Samson slaying the Timnæan 'had nothing in his hand.' Hercules catches the Cerynean stag, the Erymanthian boar, and the Cretan bull: Samson catches three hundred foxes. Hercules van-

quishes the army of the Minyans: Samson slays a thousand Philistines. The weapon of the one is a club: of the other, a bone. Hercules erects two pillars at the gates of Europe and Africa: Samson carries upon a hill the two posts of the gate of Gaza, and breaks the two pillars of the temple of Dagon. Hercules is the slave of Omphale: Samson slavishly obeys his mistress. Hercules dies through his wife Deianira: Samson, through his Delilah. Both go willingly and solemnly to their death; the one disappears amid peals of thunder: the other, among the ruins of a crumbling temple. There is also a curious story about Hercules preserved in Herodotus,[5] which strongly resembles the last part of the Samson legend: 'When Hercules came to Egypt the Egyptians put a chaplet upon his head, and led him out in festive procession, to sacrifice him to Zeus; he at first submitted quietly, but when they began the sacred rites about him at the altar, he forcibly resisted, and slew them all.' Some discover a resemblance between the Hebrew and the Grecian Hercules even in their very names. The latter was originally called Alcæus, meaning *the strong*, and according to Josephus[6] this was also the signification of the name Samson (*shimshōn*), an opinion which has been variously defended on etymological grounds.[7] The

[5] ii. 45.

[6] 'Antiquities,' V. viii. 4.

[7] E. Meier ('Geschichte der poetischen National-Literatur der Hebräer,' p. 105) considers *shimshōn* (or, perhaps, *shamshōn*, judging by

more common explanation of the Hebrew name, however, makes it a derivative of *shemesh*, sun,[8] which gives its bearer at once a mythological appearance.

Be this as it may, the mythological origin of the kindred Hebrew and Grecian legends, and their connection with the sun-myths of the ancients, have been almost completely established. The Tyrian Baal, Melkart, in whom Herodotus recognized Hercules, and whose temple, with the two shining pillars, he describes,[9] is probably the prototype of both Hercules and Samson, figures nationally modified. That Phœnician divinity is a Baal-Hamman, that is, a Sun-Baal; in bilingual inscriptions the Greek translation of *Melkart* is *Heracles;* and as the Tyrian Hercules Baal-Melkart is generally known among the Greeks.[10] Melkart, as Duncker states it,[11] was one of those divinities in which 'the Syrians combined the conceptions of beneficent and destruc-

the spellings of the Septuagint and Vulgate) to be a quadriliteral derivative of *shāman*, formed like *zarzīph*, from *zāraph*, and *karkob*, from *kārab:* 'Even in its plain form, *shāmēn* signifies *a strong man, a robust warrior* (Judg. iii. 29), like *mishnan* (Ps. lxxviii. 31, Is. x. 16).' Fürst derives *shimshōn*, 'the distinguished, the hero,' from *shāmash*, 'to be shining, distinguished, noble . . . *to be strong, powerful*,' and compares 'Sanskrit *svar*, light-ether, heaven, whence *çura* = κύριος, *heros*.'

[8] Formed like *dāgōn*, from *dāg*, and *sahărōn*, from *sahar*.

[9] ii. 44.

[10] See Gesenius, 'Thesaurus' (*s. v. ba'al*), and 'Scripturæ Linguæque Phœniciæ Monumenta,' vol. i. p. 170 *et seq.*

[11] 'Geschichte des Alterthums,' vol. i. (fifth ed.) p. 334 *et seq.*

tive powers of heaven. . . . a working and subduing god, who creates new life out of destruction, conquers the pernicious signs of the zodiac, and again and again brings back the sun, to act benignly, from its perigee and its apogee—out of excessive heat and winterly cold ; and whose life is seen imaged in the course of the sun itself. When the sun was burning most scorchingly, standing in the sign of the lion, the benign sun-god had to subdue the lion, the symbol of scorching heat ; on his own bosom he pressed the lion to death, pressed back the fiery rays into himself, burned himself in his own fire. The good sun-god had to subdue the evil sun-god, or burn himself, in order to reawake, renew his youth, and pour a milder warmth upon the earth. When the sun was most remote the Baal of Tyre had gone to distant lands, or fallen asleep. . . . For his people . . . Melkart subdued the wild tribes of distant coasts, founded the ancient Phœnician settlements on the western shores of the Mediterranean, and, as landmarks of his wanderings on the extreme border of the earth, erected his two great pillars, the rockhills Calpe and Abyle on the strait of Gibraltar. . . . The Greeks merged Melkart, in his shape of lion-vanquisher and wanderer, in their Heracles.' And the original identity of the Samson myth with the myths of both Melkart and Hercules is thus contended for by Seinecke,[12] mainly after Steinthal :[13] ' If Dagon is

[12] ' Geschichte des Volkes Israel,' vol. i. p. 253 *et seq.*

[13] In the ' Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie ' (ii. 21).

the name of the fish-god, from *dāg*, fish, Shimshon is the name of the sun-god, from *shemesh*, sun. And thus Samson is the same god with the Syrian [14] Hercules and the Grecian Heracles ; he is the sun-god, goes his way alone, goes alone through all his adventures, and begins his deeds with the killing of a lion—a lion, however, who is not a real beast, but the lion of the heavens, a constellation of the zodiac, which the sun enters in the hottest time of the year. This is the most favorable season for bees, when honey cŏmes from the devourer, and sweetness from the strong. This saying has sense as a proverb ; but if the symbolic lion is turned into a real one the riddle has no right meaning. . . . In Samson the sun appears also in its destructive form. The fox, from its red color, is an image of sun-glow, on account of which in Rome, at the festival of Ceres, a fox-hunt was held in the circus, on which occasion burning torches were tied to the tails of the foxes. The festival was celebrated shortly before the harvest, when the crops could still be injured by the solar fire, symbolically conceived as a red fox running through the fields. . . . Samson has his strength in his hair, for the sun evinces its strength in its rays. But Delilah, that is, the drooping, the feeble, cuts off his hair, for at the decline of the year the sun loses its strength. . . . The cut off hair returns in a new growth, and with it the old strength comes back : in

[14] *Sic.*

spring nature revives from its death. . . . When, in later, monotheistic times, the original meaning of Samson was misunderstood, and people knew no longer what the locks of the Israelitish Phœbus Apollo signified, it became obvious, in the light of the law, that the judge Samson had been a Nazarite from his mother's womb.'

It must be added that Samson's career begins in the close vicinity of Beth-Shemesh, where, as the name shows,[15] a temple of the sun probably existed in Canaanitish or Philistine times. That the Melkart myth of Phœnicia, before it received its Israelitish coloring, was current in a modified form among the Philistines, with whom the Danites were in constant communication, is to be presumed. In the ballads sung in Gath and 'the streets of Ashkelon' the Tyrian Hercules may have been transformed into a Philistine Goliath,[16] who carried the torch and death into the camps of Dan, and strangled the lion Judah; and Samson may have been a Hebrew offset to the songs of 'the daughters of the Philistines.' A possibility, of course, remains of Dan's having in reality possessed a man of extraordinary valor and strength, who could easily be metamorphosed by poets into a Hebrew Hercules, and, what is more, deserved to be reckoned among the judges of Israel. To such a

[15] It signifies *house,* or *temple, of the sun.*

[16] *Goliath*] This name is by Dieterici, Mühlau and Volck, and others explained to mean *splendor,* or *shining;* the Arabic *ǵilā,* and *ǵalwa,* splendor, are compared.

Danite, outside of the story before us, there is a solitary, veiled allusion in the Hebrew Scriptures—if the words in Jacob's Blessing 'Dan shall judge his people, as one of the tribes of Israel . . .'[17] are rightly interpreted.[18]

[17] Gen. xlix. 16, 17.

[18] Another allusion has been sought in Samuel's 'Bedan' (I. Sam. xii. 11), the name of a defender of Israel placed between the names of Jerubbaal (Gideon) and Jephthah, and explained to be equivalent to *ben dān*, son of Dan; but that name (בדן) probably stands in the Hebrew text, by mistake, for Barak (ברק), which the Septuagint and the Syriac and Arabic versions all have, or, possibly, for Abdon (עבדן), as some surmise.

XVII.

We are approaching historical times. The legendary figures of the book of Judges are succeeded in Samuel by persons whose reality, the main features of whose historical activity, there is no reason to doubt. An age of myths, in which but dim shadows of real life can be discerned, is followed by a dawn of history, in which, though the scene is still covered with a mythical haze, events take a more and more natural course, and the actors are generally men of natural size and features. The accounts of the events begin to be closely and chronologically connected, and appear to be, in part at least, based on trustworthy documents or tradition. Anachronisms, glaring discrepancies, and evidences both of credulity in accepting facts and design in coloring them are not wanting; but incongruities are rare, the supernatural appears incidental, and the truth of history pierces through the fiction. Criticism, applied to this new field of Hebrew history, ceases to be purely conjectural, and is here and there also allowed to act constructively. Its destructive work is often but too easy indeed. And this is chiefly the case where poetry, in songs or fragments, has been connected with the relation of events. Thus it requires but a fugitive critical glance over what is given as a prayer of Hannah[1] to

[1] I. Sam. ii. 1–10. In this work the poem will be given at its place in history.

find out that a song which speaks of Jehovah's king and anointed is not the effusion of the mother of Samuel, who anointed the first king in Israel, though it contains a figurative allusion to a barren woman, which Hannah was.

The psalm ascribed to Hannah is, in Samuel, evidently the insertion of a late hand. But the book contains also poetical fragments given as integral parts of the narrative. A few such appear in the story of the extermination of Amalek,[2] in which the last judge and the first king of Israel, Samuel and Saul, figure together, the one as a stern sacrificer in the service of Jehovah, and the other as a royal victim of heartless theocracy. The writer evidently viewed matters with the eyes of theocracy, and, in making the prophet and the king act together in a scene full of tragic pathos, he meant to represent in the former an inflexible guardian of a divine enactment, and in the latter a victim of imperfect obedience to the revealed will of Jehovah. His object was to explain the real, the divine, cause of the downfall of the first dynasty.

Samuel, we read, said to Saul, 'Thus says Jehovah of Hosts, "I remember what Amalek did to Israel . . . when he came up from Egypt: now go and smite Amalek, and destroy all that he has, and spare him not; but slay both man and woman, infant and suckling, ox and sheep, camel and ass."' And Saul marched with a large army against the

[2] I. Sam. xv.

Amalekites, smote them 'from Havilah to where thou reachest Shur, which faces Egypt,' took their king Agag captive, and destroyed all the people with the edge of the sword. But Saul and the people spared Agag, and the best of the sheep and oxen. Then Samuel received this word of Jehovah: 'I repent that I have set up Saul to be king.' It grieved Samuel, but he went to meet Saul. He found him in Gilgal. The king, after greeting him, said, 'I have performed Jehovah's command.' But Samuel said, 'What means then this bleating of the sheep in my ears, and the lowing of the oxen which I hear?' Saul explained that the people had spared the animals to sacrifice to Jehovah. Samuel bitterly reproached him with disobedience to the distinct command which he had received, and Saul again asserted that he had obeyed, had brought Agag, and utterly destroyed the Amalekites, but that the people had spared the best of the sheep and oxen, to sacrifice to Jehovah, the prophet's God. Whereupon Samuel said, 'Has Jehovah as much delight in burnt-offerings and sacrifices as in obeying Jehovah's voice?

(I. Samuel XV. 22, 23.)

Behold, to obey is better than a sacrifice,
to hearken than the fat of rams.
Defiance is as sinful as witchcraft,
stubbornness as idolatry and housegod-worship.

Because thou hast rejected the word of Jehovah, he rejects thee as king.' Saul acknowledged his guilt, which he had committed in obeying the people, and implored forgiveness, begging Samuel to appear with him before Jehovah. The prophet refused, once more announced Saul's rejection, and turned about to go. Saul seized the skirt of his mantle, and it was rent. Whereupon the prophet said, 'Jehovah has rent the kingdom of Israel from thee this day, and has given it to a fellowman of thine, who is better than thou. And

(XV. 29.)

Israel's power lies not, repents not,
for he is not a man to repent.'

Saul said, 'I have sinned, yet honor me now, I pray thee, before the elders of my people, and before Israel, and turn back with me, that I may worship Jehovah, thy God.' Samuel yielded. He then ordered Agag to be brought before him. The captive came cheerfully, saying, 'Surely, the bitterness of death is gone.' And Samuel said:

(XV. 33.)

'As thy sword has made women childless,
be thy mother childless among women.'

And, saying this, he hewed Agag in pieces on the sacrificial ground in Gilgal. This was the last time

that Samuel and Saul met in their lives. 'And Jehovah repented that he had made Saul king over Israel.'

This last remark, which is a repetition of what Jehovah told Samuel before the latter went to see Saul, is in itself sufficient to prove the inauthenticity of the dialogue between the prophet and the king of Israel. Not only did Samuel not use the words 'Israel's power lies not, repents not, for he is not a man to repent'—for it was the announcement of Jehovah's repenting of his first choice of a king that he came to make—but it seems preposterous to assume that the original writer of the account put those words into Samuel's mouth, at the very moment that he twice wrote an assertion to the contrary. They were inserted by somebody who knew by heart these words of Balaam: 'God is not a man, that he should lie; not the son of man, that he should repent,' [3] but was mindless of the context before him. Nor have the other poetical words addressed to Saul a genuine look, as coming from Samuel. The sentiments they embody are evidently too noble for the age in which that prophet acted. But the authenticity not only of the single expressions used in the account is questionable, but the truth of the whole of Saul's impeachment by Samuel. For, unfortunately, there is a different story in the same book [4] equally aiming to show the

[3] Num. xxiii. 19.

[4] I. Sam. xiii.

reason of Saul's rejection. It is this: Saul was in Gilgal, preparing to repel a powerful invasion of the Philistines, and waiting for the arrival of Samuel. And he tarried seven days, but Samuel came not at the time appointed by himself, and the people began to scatter. Then Saul said, 'Bring hither a burnt-offering and peace-offerings,' and he sacrificed the burnt-offering. At that moment Samuel arrived. Saul went out to salute him. Samuel asked, 'What hast thou done?' Saul answered that he did himself the sacrificing, because he saw the people scattering, and was afraid lest the Philistines should fall upon him at Gilgal before supplications were made to Jehovah. But Samuel answered, 'Thou hast done foolishly: thou hast not kept the commandment of Jehovah, thy God, which he commanded thee. Now would Jehovah have established thy kingdom in Israel for ever, but now thy kingdom shall not stand: Jehovah has sought for himself a man after his own heart, and Jehovah has ordered him to be chief over his people. For thou hast not kept what Jehovah commanded thee.' The narrator of this earlier scene at Gilgal, it is true, deserves less credit than the narrator of the later, for his account of Saul's rejection has not the least intrinsic merit: Saul waits till the last moment for the arrival of Samuel, performs sacrifices both from religious and patriotic motives, and is rejected for disobeying a commandment which is not stated. But this account affects the credibility of the other not only as a different version of an im-

portant fact—Saul's rejection—in the same book, but chiefly by its spirit and tendency: it shows how reasons were manufactured for the doom of the house of Saul, possibly from dynastic, but more probably from pious motives, at a time when a national revival under a scion of the house of David was the hope of all zealous Israelites. Both accounts betray not only an inclination to condemn the heroic but unfortunate first king of Israel on the flimsiest of grounds, but also an unbecoming haste to contrast with his tragic fate the better fortunes of his successor David; for both make Samuel announce to Saul that Jehovah had chosen a better man to take his place, though the prophet received the first divine intimation to that effect after both scenes at Gilgal.[5]

Nor is the statement of the extermination of Amalek strictly authentic; for many years after Saul's war we find that tribe again occupying, with others, the land to the south of Judah, from the border of the latter 'to where thou reachest Shur, and as far as the land of Egypt.'[6] This being so, the poetical embellishment of the story of Agag's death—the words addressed to the captive by his slayer—can surely not be presumed to be derived from a historical record. They may possibly have been taken from a popular ballad on his fall, or on somebody else's.

[5] Compare the beginning of I. Sam. xvi. with the concluding part of xv.

[6] I. Sam. xxvii. 8.

XVIII.

David, a shepherd boy—we are further told in the book of Samuel—was secretly anointed king as successor to Saul, by the prophet who had anointed the latter. Some time after, in a war with the Philistines, he procured the victory to his people by slaying in an unequal single combat the enemy's giant champion Goliath. On his 'return from the slaughter of the Philistine'—or before it, and for an entirely different reason as another account in the same book has it[1]—he was brought to the court of Saul, at once captured the heart of the king's son Jonathan, and by new services rose to be a commander of the army. At this point, the story—obviously compounded of incongruous traditions—takes a strange turn. We read: When they came home, David 'returning from the slaughter of the Philistine,' the women came out of all the cities of Israel, singing and dancing, and with instruments of music, to meet King Saul; and, as they played, they sang:

(I. Samuel XVIII. 7.)

'Saul has struck down his thousands,
David his tens of thousands.'

This exceedingly displeased the king, who said,

[1] Compare I. Sam. xvii. 55–58 with xvi. 14–23.

'To David they ascribe tens of thousands, and to me but thousands: what he needs still is royalty.' 'From that day' Saul hostilely eyed David, and 'on the morrow' attempted to pierce him with his javelin. This clashes so badly with the preceding less romantic statement of David's gradual advancement in the service of Saul, that the authenticity of the singing women's refrain, in its connection with the event, appears more than questionable. What, in addition, almost entirely destroys it is the intrinsic improbability of companies of women going out from the cities to meet their victorious king, and in concert singing a song calculated to humble him, and based on a fiction—for Saul's army struck down its thousands, but David only one man. If the refrain is not the invention of a narrator anxious to magnify the fame of David, and to tell how Saul went mad through jealousy of a better man than himself, it may have formed a part of a song of a later age, by which the daughters of Israel, amid their dances at the public festivals, celebrated ancient victories over the hated Philistines, victories both of King Saul and King David, achieved with the sword, the spear, and the bow. In the same age the little boys of Israel were told in amusing stories how a certain shepherd boy of ancient times, David, the son of Jesse of Bethlehem, snatched a lamb of his flock out of the mouth of a lion, that had come with a bear, and killed both the lion and the bear; how an old prophet found out by the shep-

herd boy's ruddy cheeks, fine eyes, and good looks that he was chosen by God to become the shepherd of his people, and secretly anointed him king; how he played the guitar so charmingly that he was sent for by the king, whose mind God had distracted, to dispel his evil moods with his music; and how, when accidentally witnessing a grand battle array, he offered to fight a tremendously armed Philistine giant, whose challenge no Hebrew champion dared to accept, and actually killed him by slinging a smooth stone out of the brook straight into his forehead, after which all the Philistines ran away—stories which the pious credulity of a still later age turned into history.[2]

[2] I. Sam. xvi., xvii.

XIX.

The whole of Israel's early history, from Moses down to David's selection as king, is reviewed by a psalmist in the following moralizing retrospect:

(Psalm LXXVIII.)

(1) Listen, O my people, to my instruction;
incline your ear to the words of my mouth.
I open my mouth in a parable,
utter obscure sayings of old.
What we have heard and know,
what our fathers have told us,
we will not hide from their children;
but recount to a late generation Jehovah's praises,
his might, and the wonders he wrought.
(5) He set up a testimony in Jacob,
established a law in Israel,
which he commanded our fathers
to make known to their children;
that it might be known to a late generation,
to children afterward born,
who should arise and tell it to their own;
that they might place their trust in God,
and not forget the Mighty One's deeds,
and keep his commandments;
and not be as their fathers,
a generation refractory and rebellious,

a generation not steadfast in its heart,
nor truthful with God in its spirit.
The sons of Ephraim, bearers and wielders of bows,
turned back in the day of battle.
(10) They kept not God's covenant,
refused to walk in his law ;
they forgot his deeds,
the wonders he had shown them.
In the sight of their fathers he did marvellous things,
in the land of Egypt, in the field of Tanis.[1]
He cleft the sea, and carried them across ;
made the waters stand as a dike ;
and led them with a cloud by day,
and all the night with a glare of fire.
(15) He cleft rocks in the wilderness,
and gave water as from the mighty deep.
He drew streams from the cliff,
and made waters flow out as rivers.
But they continued to sin against him,
to rebel against the Most High in the desert.
They tempted God in their heart,
demanding food for their craving.
They spoke against God,
saying, 'Can the Mighty One set a table in the wilderness ?
(20) lo, he struck the rock, that waters gushed out,

[1] Tanis (Heb. *çō'an*, Eg. *Tān*) stands here probably for the whole of north-eastern Egypt, the scene of the exodus

and overflowing brooks :
can he give bread also ?
can he provide flesh for his people ?'
Therefore, Jehovah, hearing it, became incensed,
and fire was kindled in Jacob,
and anger rose against Israel—
because they believed not in God,
trusted not in his deliverance.
He commanded the skies above,
and opened the doors of heaven ;
rained upon them manna for food,
and gave them heavenly grain ;
(25) men ate the food of angels ;
he sent them their fill of provision.
He made the east-wind traverse the sky,
and led the south-wind on with his might ;
and precipitated flesh upon them as dust,
and winged fowl as sand of the sea ;
he dashed it all down into the midst of their camp,
round about their tents ;
and they ate and were over-satisfied—
thus he gave them what they craved for.
(30) They had not abandoned their craving yet,
their food was still in their mouths,
when God's anger rose against them,
and he slew the fattest of them,
and laid low the flower of Israel.
For all this they still sinned,
and believed not in his wonders.
So he consumed their days in emptiness,

their years in terror.
When he slew them, they sought him,
returning, and eagerly inquiring after the Mighty One.
(35) They remembered that God was their rock,
the Mighty One, the Most High, their redeemer.
They flattered him with their mouth,
and lied to him with their tongue ;
their heart was not steadfast with him,
they were not true to his covenant.
But he is compassionate, forgives guilt, and destroys not ;
he often calms his anger, and rouses not all his wrath.
He remembered that they were flesh,
a breath that passes away and comes not back.
(40) How often they provoked him in the wilderness,
grieved him in the desert !
Again and again they tempted God,
and troubled the Holy One of Israel.
They remembered not his hand,
the day when he redeemed them from the foe ;
how he wrought his signs in Egypt,
and his portents in the field of Tanis.
He turned their rivers[2] into blood,
of their streams they could not drink.
(45) He sent stinging flies among them, which ate them up,
and frogs, which destroyed them.

[2] *their rivers*] The rivers of the Egyptians.

He gave their crop to the gnawing insect,
their produce to the locust.
He killed with hail their vines,
their sycamores with frost.[3]
He delivered up their cattle to the hail,
their flocks to lightning-flames.
He cast upon them the heat of his anger,
wrath, and fury, and anguish—
a host of messengers of disaster.
(50) He levelled a path for his anger,
withheld not their breath from death,
and delivered up their lives to the pestilence.
He struck down every first-born in Egypt,
the firstlings of strength in the tents of Ham.[4]
And he made his people wander like sheep,
guided them like a flock in the wilderness;
led them in security, free from fear,
while the sea overwhelmed their foes.
He brought them to his holy border,
to the hill which his right hand acquired;
(55) and drove out nations before them,
allotted their lands as an inheritance by line,
and allowed Israel's tribes to dwell in their tents.
Yet they tempted and disobeyed God, the Most High,
and kept not his testimonies:

[3] *frost*] A conjectural rendering of the Hebrew *'hănāmāl*, which occurs nowhere else, after the Septuagint, the Vulgate, Saadiah, and others.

[4] *Ham*] See above, II., note 10.

They withdrew, became treacherous like their fathers,
turned back, like a deceitful bow.[5]
They angered him with their high-places,
exasperated him with their graven images.
God heard, and became incensed,
and utterly spurned Israel ;
(60) he rejected the dwelling at Shiloh,
the tent which he had set up among men ;
delivered his pride to captivity,
his splendor into the hand of the foe ;
gave up his people to the sword,
showed his ire to his possession.
Fire devoured the youths,
the maidens were not sung,[6]
the priests fell by the sword,
the widows lamented not.[7]

[5] An allusion to what is said above of the Ephraimites, as wielders of bows who turn in the battle.

[6] *were not sung*] The rendering of *lō hullālū* in the Masoretic text ; this is, however, probably, a corruption of *lō hillēlū*, sang not (the praise of the fallen youths, just as ' the widows lamented not ' their fallen husbands), or of *lō hōlīlū* (=*hēlīlū*), from *yālal*, to lament. The Septuagint has *ουκ ἐπένθησαν*. *Cf.* Gesenius, ' Thesaurus,' *s. v. yālal*, and Graetz, ' Geschichte der Juden,' vol. i. p. 144.

[7] *he rejected the dwelling at Shiloh . . . the widows lamented not*] Shiloh, in Ephraim, the seat of the tabernacle in the times of Joshua and the judges, was deserted after the capture of the ark (Jehovah's pride and splendor) by the Philistines, in the battle described in I. Sam. iv. ; the youths of Israel fell in that battle, among them the two priests Hophni and Phinehas, the sons of Eli, and the widow of Phinehas expired without lamenting her husband, saying with her

(65) But the Lord awoke, as from sleep ;
like a hero jubilant with wine.[8]
He beat back his foes,
marked them with eternal shame.
He rejected Joseph's tent,
the tribe of Ephraim was not his choice ;
he chose the tribe of Judah,
his beloved Mount Zion.
He built his sanctuary like heaven's heights,
like the earth, which he had founded for ever.
(70) He chose David, his servant,
and took him from the sheepfolds :
from watching suckling ewes he took him
to be the shepherd of Jacob, his people,
of Israel, his possession.
And he tended them with an innocent heart,
and with skilful hands he led them.

This psalm is one of those historico-didactic productions of a very late age the object of which was to console Israel—then in subjection—with reminiscences of better times, and to inculcate the lesson, drawn from the events of the past, that only unflinching obedience to the revealed will of God could restore and preserve prosperity, consolidate

last breath, 'The glory has departed from Israel, for the ark of God is taken.'

[8] *jubilant with wine*] In Heb. *mithrōnēn miyyāyin*, instead of which Graetz ('Geschichte der Juden,' vol. ii. part i. p. 143) reads *mith'ōrēr miyyāyin*, arousing himself from wine.

the nation, and render it again powerful. The author, at the same time, thought it essential for his aim to extol the merits of the house of David, which was to reign again, and of Zion, which was to be the exclusive centre, and to brand as apostasy the separatistic tendencies of northern Palestine, of which Ephraim had been the representative. This tribe appears, therefore, in the psalm as responsible for all the iniquity of which the nation had been guilty, and for all the chastisements which guilt had drawn upon it. Ewald sees in this treatment of Ephraim a scarcely veiled attack on the Samaritans, the hostility between whom and restored Jerusalem had, he thinks, reached a high degree of intensity when our psalmist wrote. The psalm is one of the twelve[9] the authorship of which is ascribed in the superscriptions to Asaph, who, according to Chronicles, was a Levite leader of King David's choir, a seer, and a composer of the highest rank,[10] and whose descendants, 'the sons of Asaph'—if members of a poetico-musical school founded by him are not meant by this expression—appear as sacred singers and musicians in the times of David and of Ezra and Nehemiah.[11] But a mere glance over those twelve songs suffices to show that no poet of

[9] Psalms l. and lxxiii. to lxxxiii.

[10] I. Chr. vi. 24 (39), xv. 17, xvi. 5 ; II. Chr. xxix. 30 ; *cf.* Neh. xii. 46.

[11] I. Chr. xxv. 1 ; Ezra. ii. 41, iii. 10 ; Neh. vii. 44 ; *cf.* II. Chr. xx. 14. Another Asaphide, perhaps a member of the same family or school, is mentioned in II. Kings. xviii. 18, 37, and in Is. xxxvi. 3, 22.

the age of David composed them all—the theme of two[12] is the destruction of the temple and of Jerusalem—and that most of them are of post-exilian origin. And, in fact, the very existence of a poet or musician Asaph in the circle of David is suspected to be one of the myths in which the two books of Chronicles abound, as no trace of such a personage is to be found in Samuel or Kings. The psalm before us, considered as a moralizing poem—of the later Persian or of the Greek era—is a creditable production, but as a historical epitome it possesses no value whatever.

[12] Psalms lxxiv. and lxxix.

XX.

Saul's heroism delivered his people from the yoke of the Philistines, and made it triumphant over Ammon, Moab, Edom, and other enemies. His throne created unity and national integrity. His zeal for Jehovah destroyed foreign elements. His victories enriched the state. Such was the early course of his reign. But disobedience to the dictates of Samuel, which the prophet treated as disobedience to God; jealousy of David, which drove this son-in-law of the king into revolt—if it was not merely a pretext for revolt; and melancholy and violence of temper, which hostile collisions and constant fear provoked or aggravated, made the latter part of Saul's reign a period of civil distraction, which ended in a general catastrophe. The Philistines saw that their turn for victory was come. Saul had hunted David beyond the southern boundary of his kingdom, and the valiant Hebrew freebooter, with his six hundred warriors, had become a vassal of Achish, king of Gath, one of the five leading cities of Philistia. Samuel, the man whose ardor in the service of Jehovah had inspired the Israelites in their grapples with the worshippers of Dagon and Astarte, was dead; Saul's mind was distracted; Jonathan, David's friend, was distrusted by his father. The princes of Philistia now mar-

shalled their forces for a decisive blow. The last chapters of I. Samuel tell the story of Israel's defeat. The Philistines marched to the north, and the valley of Jezreel, in Issachar, became the battlefield; the invaders gathering their armies to Aphek, and the Israelites encamping by a fountain near Mount Gilboa. And the Philistine princes passed on, leading their men by hundreds and by thousands. David and his men defiled among the last with Achish. Seeing them, the other princes of Philistia asked, 'What do these Hebrews here?' Achish explained the position of David, the former servant of Saul, but now his own, and faithful to his new master. But the princes angrily answered, 'Send this fellow back; let him return to the place which thou hast assigned to him, and not go down with us to battle, lest he be there an adversary to us: for wherewith should he reconcile himself to his master, if not with the heads of these men?' Achish had to yield, and informed David of the decision, assuring him at the same time of his unshaken confidence in his fidelity. Yet David asked, 'What have I done, and what hast thou found in thy servant from the day when I appeared before thee to this day, that I may not go and fight the enemies of my lord, the king?' But Achish answered, 'Thou art as good in my sight as an angel of God, yet the princes of the Philistines have declared, "He must not go up with us to the battle."' So David returned with his men to Ziklag,

the place which Achish had assigned to him on the southern border of his dominions. Thus David, against his will, escaped the alternative of fighting his own people and king or betraying his protector. The historian evidently believed that David's intention was to betray the Philistine, and that Achish was blind, owing to years of consistent and cruel deception ; but the facts adduced in explanation of this[1] are highly improbable. Shortly after David's return the battle was fought, and the men of Israel fled before the Philistines, and fell slain on Mount Gilboa. And the Philistines pressed hard upon Saul and his sons. Jonathan and two of his brothers fell. Yet Saul continued fighting. At last he was fiercely assailed by bowmen. Seeing that he must fall into their hands alive or dead, he called to his armor-bearer, 'Draw thy sword, and pierce me with it ;' but the armor-bearer refused to slay his king, whereupon Saul fell upon his own sword, and died, and his companion, seeing it, did the same. 'So Saul died, and his three sons, and his armor-bearer, and all his men, that same day, together.' And on the morrow, when the Philistines came to strip the slain, they found among them the king of Israel and his three sons, on Mount Gilboa. They cut off the king's head, and sent it to their land, to be carried all around, in announcement of their victory ; and his headless body, with the bodies of his sons, they fastened on the wall of Beth-Shean, a town lit-

[1] I. Sam. xxvii.

tle distant from the field of battle. Terror reigned in Israel, and the people fled in every direction; but from Jabesh-in-Gilead, a town which Saul in his palmy days had saved from the Ammonites,[2] all the valiant men arose, and marched all night, and took the bodies of Saul and his sons from the wall of Beth-Shean, and, returning with them to Jabesh, buried the bones under a tree, and fasted seven days.

This relation of the death of Saul is probably the one which was current among those tribes of Israel that continued to adhere to the house of the fallen king, setting up as his successor, under the lead of Abner, his only surviving son, Ish-Bosheth, or Esh-Baal.[3] In the main it may have been correct, and, as to minute particulars, would the mourning ad-

[2] See I. Sam. xi.

[3] *Ish-Bosheth or Esh Baal*] 'His name appears (1 Chr. viii. 33, ix. 39) to have been originally Esh-Baal, . . . *the man of Baal*. Whether this indicates that *Baal* was used as equivalent to *Jehovah*, or that the reverence for Baal still lingered in Israelitish families, is uncertain; but it can hardly be doubted that the name (Ish-bosheth, "the man of *shame*") by which he is commonly known, must have been substituted for the original word, with a view of removing the scandalous sound of Baal from the name of an Israelitish king, and superseding it by the contemptuous word (Bosheth—"shame") which was sometimes used as its equivalent in later times (Jer. iii. 24, xi. 13; Hos. ix. 10). A similar process appears in the alteration of Jerubbaal (Judg. viii. 35) into Jerubbesheth (2 Sam. xi. 21); Meri-baal (1 Chr. viii. 34, ix. 40) into Mephibosheth (2 Sam. iv. 4). The three last cases all occur in Saul's family.' (Dean Stanley's 'Ish-bosheth' in Smith's 'Dictionary of the Bible.')

mirers of Saul then have asked the question, If the king 'and all his men' died on that day, together, who reported his last words? did the Philistines hear them from the lips of an expiring enemy, and announce them to their own shame? Be that as it may, for the followers of David, the men of Judah, who now anointed him their king at Hebron, there was another version of the tragic end at Gilboa. It is given in the first chapter of II. Samuel: A few days after the battle a young man came to David in Ziklag with clothes rent and earth on his head, and prostrated himself before the Hebrew chief. On David's asking him, 'Whence comest thou?' he answered, 'I am a fugitive from the camp of Israel.' David anxiously asked, 'What has happened?' 'The people have fled from the battle,' the stranger answered; 'many of the men are fallen and dead; Saul and Jonathan, his son, are dead also.' David said, 'How knowest thou that Saul and Jonathan, his son, are dead?' And the young man told him this: 'I happened by chance to be on Mount Gilboa, and perceived Saul leaning upon his spear, hard pressed by chariots and horsemen. He looked behind him, and saw me; and he called to me. I answered, "Here am I." He said to me, "Who art thou?" I answered him, "I am an Amalekite." Then he said to me, "Stand up against me, I pray thee, and kill me; for a cramp has seized me, while full life is still within me." So I stood up against him, and killed him—I knew he could not live after

his fall—and I took the crown which was on his head, and the bracelet which was on his arm, and I have brought them here to my lord.' David and his men, on hearing this, rent their clothes, and mourned, weeping and fasting. And to the bringer of the news David said, 'How didst thou dare to stretch out thy hand to destroy Jehovah's anointed?' And he commanded one of his young men to slay him, and it was done.

Was this Judæan story wholly invented, with the object of showing the magnanimity of David, who thus avenged the blood of his deadly enemy on the man who brought him the royal crown? Was a crown, said to be picked up on the battle-field before 'the Philistines came to strip the slain,' really exhibited by David and his men, in order to show how miraculously the insignia of royalty were saved for him whom God had chosen to be the ruler of Israel? Was even a wretched Amalekite sacrificed as the bringer of the news—sacrificed like the many defenceless Amalekites, men and women, whom David is stated to have previously slaughtered, in order that they should carry no news?[4] And was an Amalekite selected for a victim with the view of attaching an ignominious trait to the end of the Benjamite king, who was thus shown to have fallen not by his own sword or by that of a brave warrior, but by the hand of a vile outcast, a man of the robber tribe which that king boasted of having exter-

[4] See I. Sam. xxvii.

minated? Was the story preceding the account of the disastrous campaign, which tells us how Saul, who had exterminated the wizards from the land, was ultimately driven by mad despair to apply for help to a witch, and was treated by her with tender regards and generous feeling, concocted in the same spirit of insidious irony? or was its main object to bring Samuel once more upon the stage, and make the dead prophet repeat what the living had twice declared, that Jehovah had rent the kingly power from Saul and given it to David?[5] Each of these suppositions is more likely to be correct than the assumption that the story with which the second book of Samuel opens is true, the discrepancies between it and the account in the concluding chapter of the first book notwithstanding; that is, that a roving Amalekite chanced to be near Saul at the last moment of the battle, slew him at his own request, took off his crown in the sight of the enemy's charioteers and horsemen, to whom all the king's companions had succumbed, and successfully made his escape alone, with his treasure, not to the rallying place of the remnants of the army under Abner, but to the seat of the rebellious freebooter David, at the remotest end of the country.

But whatever the last moments of the first king of Israel and of his heroic son Jonathan may have been, well did their fall deserve the following elegy,

[5] See I. Sam. xxviii.

ascribed to David, and copied by the compiler of Samuel from the now lost 'Sepher hayyāshār:' [6]

(II. Samuel I.)

(19) The gazelle,[7] O Israel,
lies slain on thy heights—
how are the heroes fallen!

(20) Tell it not in Gath,
announce it not in the streets of Ashkelon,
lest the daughters of the Philistines rejoice,
lest the daughters of the barbarians exult.

O mountains of Gilboa,
no dew, no rain, be on you,
nor fields of offerings.
For there the shield of heroes was cast away—
the shield of Saul,
not moistened with oil,
but with the blood [8] of the slain,

[6] See above, XIV.

[7] *the gazelle*] After De Wette, Ewald, and others, who refer the term to Jonathan: *cf.* v. 25: 'Jonathan (lies) slain on thy heights.' The elegy thus beautifully varies its mentions of the fallen: it begins with 'the gazelle' Jonathan, speaks twice of 'the heroes,' and then of Saul; then of Saul and Jonathan, and of Jonathan and Saul; and then of Saul and of the heroes, and of Jonathan, twice, and of the heroes. The last mention of Jonathan alone prevents the symmetry from being perfect—a mention which by some is considered spurious.

[8] *with the blood*] *Middam*, with blood, here, exactly as in *'ăqubbāh middām*, stamped with blood (Hos. vi. 8); compare also the use of the particle *min* in the sense of *by* or *with* in *bō'ērāh mēōpheh* (Hos. vii. 4), 'burning from the baker, *i.e.* heated by the baker' (Keil), and,

with the fat of mighty warriors.
Jonathan's bow never turned back,
Saul's sword never came home empty—
Saul and Jonathan,
lovely and pleasant in life,
in death undivided ;
swifter than eagles,
braver than lions !
Daughters of Israel,
weep over Saul,
who clothed you in crimson
with costly things,
and with ornaments of gold
decked your robes.
(25) How are the heroes fallen—
in the midst of the battle !
Jonathan lies slain on thy heights.
I am distressed for thee,
Jonathan, my brother ;
thou wast so sweet to me.
Thy love to me was wonderful,
surpassing women's love.
How are the heroes fallen !
The weapons of war are lost.

In this dirge, we are told, David expressed his grief over the death of the men who barred his access to the throne of Israel. Are we to accept this

in connection with passive forms, in Ps. xxxvii. 23, Eccl. xii. 11, and Dan. viii. 11.

statement as correct? Most critics, and among them such bold inquirers as Thenius, Meier, and Oort, have no hesitation in assuming its correctness. Others, however, dissent: This assumption, says Duncker,[9] 'too much lowers the character of David. His moral complicity in Saul's fall, in the issue of the battle, must have been most clear to himself: he had been ready to take part in the warfare against Saul and Jonathan; his revolt, his desertion to the Philistines, had weakened Saul's forces, and deprived him of brave combatants.'

In trying to estimate the character of David, we must contrast one of the brightest with one of the blackest pages in his history, a history abounding in traits striking by their naturalness, and in others overcharged with tints for effect. The twenty-fourth and twenty-sixth chapters of I. Samuel depict two scenes in his life apparently betokening the highest generosity and self-control. They are generally considered by critics double versions of one tradition. We choose the latter version:[10] One

[9] 'Geschichte des Alterthums,' vol. ii. p. 90 (fourth ed.).

[10] The following from Wellhausen ('Geschichte Israels,' vol. i. p. 277) may serve to justify the choice, as well as the opinion, expressed below, of the value of the story: 'Auch in dem Abschnitt über David's Freibeuterleben K. 23–27 finden sich bedeutende Nachträge; nemlich ausser 27, 7–12 besonders die Begegnungen Davids mit seinen Verfolgern, in zwei Versionen, von denen die eine 26, 1–25 wegen v. 19 vor K. 27 eingesetzt ist, die andere 23, 14–24, 23 vor K. 25, um eine zu nahe Collision zu vermeiden. Da beide vielerwärts wörtlich übereinstimmen, so wird man Recht haben die kürzere und motivir-

day, while David was pursued by Saul in the wilderness of Judah, he ascertained through spies the king's whereabouts, and then arose himself and went to the place where he encamped. He saw the place where Saul lay; Abner, the commander of the army, was near him, and the men were in a circle around them. Returning, he asked two of his companions, 'Who would go down with me to Saul's camp?' Abishai, Zeruiah's son, the brother of Joab, volunteered to go. They went, and found Saul sleeping on the earth; his spear was stuck in the ground near his head, and Abner and the men lay fast asleep around him. Seeing this, Abishai said to David, 'This day God has delivered thy enemy into thy hand: now let me strike the spear through him to the earth, at once; I shall not do it to him a second time.' But David answered, 'Thou shalt not destroy him: who can stretch out his hand against Jehovah's anointed, and be guiltless?' At his command, Abishai took Saul's spear and cruse of water from the side of his head, and they went off without any one perceiving them. David stopped at the top of a hill afar off, and called aloud, 'An-

tere Fassung K. 26 für die Grundlage anzusehen. Dass aber auch K. 26 nicht dem echten Stocke angehört, ergibt schlagend die Folge 26, 25. 27, 1. Die Einschiebung der Zusätze ist übrigens natürlich nicht ohne allerlei Redaktionsänderungen im ältern Stoffe abgegangen. . . . Obwol von derselben Wurzel ausgehend, sind diese Wucherungen doch keineswegs gleichartig und gleichstufig. Zum Teil sind es volkstümliche Sagen und unabsichtliche Dichtungen.'

swer, Abner; wilt thou not?' Abner asked who dared to call to the king. David replied, 'Art thou not a strenuous man? and who is like thee in Israel? Why, then, hast thou not watched over thy lord, the king? And yet, some one came to destroy the king, thy lord. What thou hast done is not the right thing. As Jehovah lives, ye all deserve death for not watching over your lord, Jehovah's anointed. Look now, where is the king's spear, and his cruse of water, which were at the side of his head?' Here Saul recognized David's voice, and exclaimed, 'Is that thy voice, David, my son?' David answered, 'It is my voice, O king, my lord.' And he added, 'Why does my lord thus pursue his servant? what have I done? what evil is in my hand? . . .' And, after sending back the king's spear, he said, 'May Jehovah reward every man's righteousness and faithfulness. For Jehovah delivered thee into my hand to-day, but I refrained from stretching out my hand against Jehovah's anointed. And now, as thy life was precious in my eyes this day, so may my life be precious in the eyes of Jehovah, and may he save me from all distress.' Saul replied, 'Be blessed, David, my son; thou wilt surely act, and surely prevail.' And they parted.—The David who acted thus toward his foe might well have composed a noble lament on his death.

With this David the outlaw we must contrast David the king in his dealing with Shimei, the son of Gera, a man related to the house of Saul. When

David had left Jerusalem in his flight before his son Absalom, Shimei—the scene is vividly depicted in the sixteenth chapter of II. Samuel—came forth, cursing as he came. He cast stones at David and his officers, while the men of the royal host and the great champions were marching on the king's right and left. And thus cried Shimei, cursing: 'Go out, go out, thou man of blood, man of Belial. Jehovah brings back upon thee all the blood of the house of Saul, in whose stead thou hast reigned. Jehovah has now given the royal power into the hand of Absalom, thy son; and thou art taken in thy own mischief, for thou art a man of blood.' And Abishai, the son of Zeruiah, said to David, 'Why should this dead dog curse my lord, the king? O, let me go over, and take off his head.' But the king answered, 'What is there between me and you, sons of Zeruiah? Let him curse; for Jehovah has told him, "Curse David," and who should ask, "Why hast thou done so?"' And he added, speaking to all his officers, 'Behold, my son, who sprang from my bowels, seeks my life: why should not now this Benjamite? Leave him alone, let him curse, for Jehovah has bidden him.' The continuation is given in the nineteenth chapter of the same book: Absalom's insurrection was suppressed, the king returning from beyond the Jordan, and the men of Judah hastening to meet him, to conduct him over the river. With them came Shimei, with a thousand other Benjamites, and when David had been ferried

across the Jordan, he threw himself before his feet and implored his forgiveness. Abishai again demanded Shimei's head, and David again sternly rebuked the fierceness of the sons of Zeruiah, saying, 'Shall any man be put to death this day? It is this day that I know that I am king over Israel.' And he said to Shimei, 'Thou shalt not die.' And the king swore it to him. The concluding part consists of the very last words of David, addressed to his young son and crowned successor Solomon. As recorded in the second chapter of I. Kings, they were literally these: 'Behold, thou hast with thee Shimei, the son of Gera, a Benjamite of Bahurim, who cursed me with wild curses on the day when I went to Mahanaim; but he came down to the Jordan to meet me, and I swore to him by Jehovah, saying, "I will not put thee to death with the sword." Now, thou leave him not unpunished; thou art a clever man, and wilt know what to do to him; thou shalt bring down his hoary head to the grave in blood.'—The man who with his dying breath bequeathed to his child this legacy of vindictiveness and perjury never wrote a line of the pure elegy before us. No 'quantum mutatus ab illo!' can bridge over the chasm which lies between David the outlaw in the wilderness of Judah and David the dying monarch—if those last words are true.

But, fortunately for the honor of humanity, they are *not* true. An Attila, a Timour, would have whispered no such words in the hour of death, and

why should we believe such infamy of a king of Israel, a servant of Jehovah, who had exhausted the sweets of power, and drunk the bitter dregs of ambition, in a reign of forty years; who had so often been forced to repent of rashness, of acts of passion, and of bloodshed? Are such words natural on such a death-bed? And who is the authority for them? Who heard them whispered? Solomon alone, of course, who related them when he sent his executioner to despatch Shimei; just as he related a similar injunction of his dying father when he sent his executioner to tear Joab, the hoary-headed champion and savior of David's throne, from the altar to which he clung for protection, and despatch him. The historian, who did not know the Roman maxim, 'His is the crime whom it benefits,' implicitly believed what was told by Solomon, or by his minions, though the crimes which the stories were to palliate could benefit only that king. With the same credulity the same historian, in his following chapter, gives us a full account of a dream of Solomon—a dream exceedingly flattering to the monarch—relating it with the assurance of an eye-witness; and yet, the royal dreamer, whose young hands were then red with the blood not only of Joab and Shimei, but of his own brother Adonijah, was certainly capable of inventing a dream, if it was to raise him in the estimation of his people.

Equally incredible is a great part of the following

account contained in II. Samuel :[11] David saw Bath-Sheba, the beautiful wife of Uriah the Hittite, bathing, while her husband was with Joab at the siege of Rabbah, the capital of Ammon. He sent messengers for her, and some time after her return to her house she sent him word that she was with child. The king (in order to disguise the paternity of the child to be born) had Uriah sent back from the army, and, after inquiring about the progress of the war, dismissed him with presents, telling him to go to his house. But the warrior lay down among the king's servants, at the entrance of the palace. David, speedily informed of it by his men, called him to himself, and said, 'Hast thou not come from a journey? why dost thou not go to thy house?' Uriah answered, 'The ark and Israel and Judah are in tents, and my lord Joab and the officers of my lord are encamped in the open field : shall I then go to my house, to eat and drink and lie with my wife? As thou livest, and as thy soul lives, I will not do that.' David kept him back a whole day, made him eat and drink in his palace, and intoxicated him ; but in vain : Uriah in the evening did as he had done in the preceding one. Thus baffled in his device, David, in the morning, wrote the following letter to Joab, sending it by the hand of Uriah : 'Set ye Uriah in the forefront of the hottest battle, and retire from him, that he may be struck down, and die.' Joab placed Uriah where he knew he

[11] xi., xii.

would encounter the bravest of the Ammonites, and ordered an approach to the wall of Rabbah; and was soon able to send to his king the report of a repulse, which the messenger was very explicitly instructed to conclude with these words: 'Thy servant Uriah the Hittite is among the dead.' And David sent the man back to Joab with this reply, 'Let this affair cause thee no grief, for the sword devours both ways.' Uriah's widow duly mourned her husband, and when the mourning was over, David sent for her, and she became his wife. But the child of adultery died. David bore his loss with composure, and comforted Bath-Sheba, and she bore him Solomon.

The villany of David is here painted in colors so amazingly black, and the patriotic virtue of Uriah is so admirably contrasted with it, in order to deepen its blackness, that we can discover at a glance that we have no exact history before us, but a piece of court scandal worked up by a hostile hand into a tissue of the most revolting crimes. Such may have been the hand of a Benjamite, or more probably of an Ephraimite, anxious to cover with infamy the record of David and Solomon. The intrinsic improbabilities of the narrative are glaring: David sends 'messengers' to bring him the wife of an absent warrior; his servants are his accomplices in open attempts to deceive the outraged patriot; he orders his commander-in-chief by an autograph letter to fight a battle and lose it, in

order to bring about the death of an innocent man; the general obeys without hesitation, and reports the result with cynic coolness; his master rewards him with a gracious word of comfort, which lays bare the depth of his own baseness; the ravished woman is made the queen of the blood-stained adulterer, and the people utter no murmur. Now, were David, Joab, and their associates all monsters both of heartlessness and hypocrisy? Could an ambitious general like Joab, who, from the beginning to the end of his high career, lorded it over his monarch, be trusted with a written order demanding treacherous desertion in battle for the sake of assassination—an order the divulgation of which ought to have sufficed to place that victorious commander upon the throne, instead of the assassin?

It is true, there is a supplement to the story, perhaps by a more friendly hand: The prophet Nathan rebukes the king, and he acknowledges his guilt. But this very supplement serves to prove that the most shocking part of the story, the assassination of Uriah, is not true; for the tale with which Nathan confounded the guilty monarch speaks of a rich man robbing his poor neighbor of his only lamb—that is, alludes to the king's adding to his well-stocked harem the only wife of a modest subject—but contains no allusion whatever to assassination following robbery or rape. Only the prophetic sermon attached to the tale, and made to harmonize the rebuke with the account of the crime,

speaks again of the murder. The rape of Bath-Sheba, the theme of Nathan's rebuke, is probably a true event, and, ignominious as it is, it has but too many parallels in the history of kings, oriental and occidental; but the unparalleled story of the death of Uriah is undoubtedly a fiction.

And a fiction, on the other hand, is, most probably, the romantic tale of David's carrying off the spear of Saul from his resting-place in the very centre of a camp. This story is the opposite of monstrous, and implies no impossibility; but its improbability is patent from every feature, and the existence of a duplicate to it adds to its untrustworthiness. Nor would the mere fact stated, if true—but deprived of its embellishments, and coolly examined—prove any thing beyond the readiness of David to risk a very dangerous exploit, personally or through Abishai, for the sake of proving his innocence and magnanimity before Saul or the people. For the assassination of Saul, Jehovah's anointed, as proposed by Abishai, would, instead of seating David on the throne, certainly have doomed him to lifelong exile and eternal infamy. Even after the pretended act of noble self-denial, which David's men may have invented and circulated, and after the catastrophe of Mount Gilboa, which overwhelmed the house of Saul, it took the Judæan chief seven years of strife and intrigue to approach the throne of all Israel, and only the desertion of Abner, the Benjamite commander-in-chief, and the

succeeding assassination of Ish-Bosheth, made it possible for him to ascend it.

There still remains, however, a string of acts and incidents in the life of David, less unusual in appearance and less antagonistic to each other, which will be more apt to decide the question whether that son-in-law of Saul, and friend of Jonathan, may be presumed to have written an elegy on their death so touching by its deep sentiment and chaste simplicity. Surely, too much importance must not be attached to single statements and traits, and especially to such as bear the stamp of elaboration on them; but we cannot avoid observing that all the dealings of David with Saul and his family, as recorded, display not a spirit of love and tenderness, but of duplicity, rudeness, and vindictiveness. The compiler of David's history—probably from sources of widely different character—seriously endeavored to make him appear magnanimous, to extenuate his failures, or to cover them with the veil of repentance; but, unfortunately, he but lightly retouched the picture, and the dark spots pierce through the thin coating which was to hide them. Let us follow the course of the history—not to learn the details, few of which may be accurate, but to obtain a general impression:

Scarcely has David appeared before Saul, after the victory over Goliath, when Jonathan's soul becomes attached to his, and he loves him as his own self. The prince makes a covenant with him, and,

stripping himself of his garments, his sword, his bow, and his girdle, gives them to his friend. We are not told that David returned to him either love or tokens of love.[12]

Saul, having become jealous of David on account of his great popularity, tries to expose him to great dangers by giving him one of his daughters in marriage and demanding for this favor arduous military services. David, though inclined to accept the offer, and, according to the preceding accounts, already high in command, and secretly anointed king, demurs, protesting his littleness and poverty, his low descent and low standing.[13]

Jonathan warns David that the king meditates his ruin, advises him to conceal himself, and, strenuously interceding with his father, brings him back to the court. When, after new persecutions, David again meets Jonathan, he rudely asks his devoted friend, 'What have I done, what is my iniquity, and what is my sin before thy father, that he seeks my life?' Jonathan answers, 'Whatever thy soul desires I will do.' David proposes a new concealment, with the view of ascertaining Saul's disposition, and thus implores Jonathan's aid, 'Deal kindly with thy servant, for thou hast brought thy servant into a covenant with thee before Jehovah,' cruelly adding, 'Yet, if there be iniquity in me,

[12] I. Sam. xviii. 1–4.

[13] *Ibid.*, 14 *et seq.*

slay me thyself: why shouldst thou bring me to thy father?'[14]

He is not brought back, but is told by Jonathan to seek safety in flight. They part, and David becomes a chief of freebooters. Saul pursues him, but Jonathan clandestinely meets him in his southern wilderness, and says to him, 'Fear not, for the hand of Saul, my father, shall not find thee; thou shalt be king over Israel, and I will be next to thee. Even Saul, my father, knows it.' David opposes not a word to this self-surrender of the heir to the throne, and a new covenant before Jehovah sanctions the sacrifice.[15]

Jonathan falls with his father and two brothers on Mount Gilboa, and David, ignoring the surviving legitimate brother's right to the succession, sets himself up as king in Hebron, being anointed by the men of Judah, his tribe. His first act is to send this artful message to the people of Jabesh-in-Gilead: 'Blessed be ye of Jehovah, for having shown kindness to your lord, to Saul, by burying him. And now may Jehovah show you kindness and constant favor, and I, too, will thus do you good, because ye have done that thing. And now also let your hands be firm, and be ye strenuous men; for your lord Saul is dead, and the house of Judah have anointed me king over them.' The answer which the true men of Jabesh returned to the chief

[14] I. Sam. xix. 1–7, xx. 1–8.

[15] I. Sam. xxiii. 15–18.

who had joined the Philistines in their march against Saul and Jonathan is not recorded.[16]

War soon breaks out between David and Ish-Bosheth, and the former waxes stronger and stronger, and the house of Saul weaker and weaker. Now it happens that Abner, the general and protector of Ish-Bosheth, his second cousin, has an amour with Rizpah, a former concubine of Saul, and is reproached with it by the Benjamite king. Enraged by the insult, he clandestinely sends messengers to David, offering to bring over all Israel to him. David accepts the offer, and concludes a secret covenant with the traitor. Abner, in pursuance of the scheme, goes with twenty men to see David at Hebron, while Joab and his fellow-officers are absent on a raid. He is well received, and departs in peace. At this moment Joab arrives, immediately repairs to David, and says, 'What hast thou done? Lo, Abner came to thee: why hast thou let him depart and go away? Thou knowest Abner, the son of Ner: he came to deceive thee, to learn thy going and coming, and to learn all thy doings.' David answers not a word, and Joab leaves him, recalls Abner through messengers, 'without David's knowledge,' and assassinates him. Hearing this, David exclaims, 'I and my kingdom are guiltless before Jehovah, forever, of the blood of Abner, the son of Ner,' and then adds atrocious imprecations on the murderer and all his father's house. The affair is

[16] II. Sam. ii. 1–7.

represented as one of private revenge: 'Joab and his brother Abishai slew Abner because he had slain their brother Asahel at Gibeon, in battle.' David ostentatiously commands Joab and all the people around him to rend their clothes, gird themselves with sackcloth, and mourn over Abner; and himself walks behind his bier, and weeps at his grave. He is also said to have uttered this short dirge over him:

(II. Samuel III. 33, 34.)

Must Abner die like a villain?
Thy hands were not tied,
thy feet not crammed into fetters:
a falling before men of violence was thy fall.

These lines, however, if really produced shortly after the event, are more probably a fragment of a song by a Benjamite, who sincerely mourned the warlike cousin of Saul. Joab might have brooked a momentary outburst of genuine or feigned rage, but he was not the man to allow his name to be publicly sullied, and his deed to be branded in commemorative strains. And David's connivance at the assassination was, it seems, strongly suspected at the time and afterward, for the narrative goes on thus: 'When all the people came to make David eat something while it was yet day, David swore thus, "So do God to me, and more so, if before sunset I taste bread, or anything else." The people took notice of it, and it pleased them; everything which

the king did pleased all the people. And all the people and all Israel understood on that day that it was not through the king that Abner, the son of Ner, was slain. And the king said to his servants, "Know ye not that a chief and a great man has fallen this day in Israel? And I am to-day strengthless, and but anointed king: those men, the sons of Zeruiah, are too hard for me—may Jehovah reward the evil-doer according to his wickedness." ' The punishment of the murder is thus left to God, and Joab is continued in his high command.[17]

The death of Abner disheartens the son of Saul and all Israel, and another assassination soon finishes the overthrow of the Benjamite kingdom, and makes David sole ruler of the land. Baanah and Rechab, formerly captains of bands in the service of Saul, hasten to earn David's gratitude by slaying his feeble rival. They surprise Ish-Bosheth in his bed, kill him, cut off his head, and, marching all night, present it to David at Hebron, with these words: 'Here is the head of Ish-Bosheth, the son of thy enemy Saul.' But David turns against them with the indignation of innocence shocked by the touch of crime, tells them what a reward for his tidings he gave to the Amalekite who brought him the news of the death of Saul, and adds, 'How much more when wicked men have slain a righteous man in his own house, on his bed? shall I not now

[17] II. Sam. iii.

require his blood of your hand, and sweep you from the earth?' At his command, they are slain, and their hands and feet cut off, and hung up over the pool at Hebron.[18] Yet the 'righteous man' thus avenged was he against whom David, after paying with death for the tidings of his father's fall, set himself up as king, carried on a protracted warfare, and plotted with Abner, thus employing both the sword of rebellion and the stab of treason to deprive him of his righteous inheritance. The many words spoken by David, and the ostentatious aggravation of the punishment inflicted on the criminals, show that in this case, too, the Judæan pretender was suspected of having instigated the deed. Critical history, with one single narrative of uncertain date and authorship before it, would be rash in attempting either to condemn or absolve David, in this case as in that of Abner. It is quite possible that the presumption against him is chiefly owing to awkward attempts to vindicate his memory, and that he was entirely innocent in both instances, and sincerely raved against the assassins, although he was only in one instance strong enough to punish the crime; it is possible that both assassinations were carried out with premeditation by the officers of David, who shut his eyes while they were acting for him, and at the end was more or less entitled by his previous ignorance to brand the deeds, and sacrifice the viler tools, while accepting the fruits; and it is also pos-

[18] II. Sam. iv.

sible that even that ignorance was altogether simulated, that he was in the worst sense the 'man of blood' which the Benjamites felt him to be, and knowingly sacrificed in Ish-Bosheth a 'righteous' ruler, and in Abner, perhaps, a spotless general, who came to Hebron—with twenty men—not to betray his master, but to negotiate an honest peace. Similar acts of ambition are frequent enough in history, but so are also false imputations of crime.

David, having been accepted as king by all Israel, and conquered Jerusalem from the Jebusites, transports thither the ark of God from Gibeah. After a temporary failure, the enterprise is carried out with great sacrificial pomp. The king himself, girded with a linen ephod, dances before the ark, while it is carried amid shouting and trumpet sounds. And as it enters the new capital, David's wife Michal, Saul's daughter, looks through the window, and sees the king leaping and dancing, and finds it despicable. On going out to meet him, she taunts him with having made an indecorous exhibition of himself, before the eyes of the handmaids of his servants, as only vile persons would do. And David thus answers the sister of Jonathan, who married him out of love,[19] and once saved his life at the risk of her own:[20] 'It was before Jehovah, who preferred me to thy father, and to all his house, to appoint me ruler over the people of Jeho-

[19] I. Sam. xviii. 20, 28.

[20] I. Sam. xix. 11 *et seq.*

vah, over Israel: therefore I sport before Jehovah; and I will yet be viler than that, and low in my own sight, and among the maidservants of whom thou speakest I shall be honored.' And the meaning of the last words is thus hinted at: 'Michal, Saul's daughter, had no child to the day of her death.' [21]

David asks, 'Is there any one left of the house of Saul, that I may show him kindness on account of Jonathan?' A servant of the house of Saul, Ziba, informs him that there is at Lo-Debar (in Gilead) a son of Jonathan, Mephibosheth, lame on both feet. He was five years old when the tidings of the death of his father and grandfather reached him; his nurse took him and fled, and in their hasty flight he fell, and became lame.[22] David sends for him, and keeps him at his court and table, enjoining on Ziba, his sons, and servants, to till for his support all the land that belonged to Saul and his house. After years, during the flight before Absalom, Ziba approaches David, with a couple of asses saddled, carrying a supply of bread, raisins, summer fruit, and wine, and politely offers the asses and all as a gift for the king's household. David asks, 'And where is thy master's son?' Ziba answers, 'He remains in Jerusalem; for he says, "Now the house of Israel will restore to me the kingly power that belonged to my father."' Then the king said to Ziba, 'Behold, thine is every thing that pertained

[21] II. Sam. vi.

[22] II. Sam. iv. 4.

to Mephibosheth.' When David returns to Jerusalem Mephibosheth comes to meet him, having neither dressed his feet nor trimmed his beard, nor washed his clothes, from the day of the king's departure till his return in peace. David asks him, 'Why didst thou not accompany me, Mephibosheth?' The unfortunate man humbly explains that while he was preparing to saddle his ass—being lame—to follow his benefactor, his servant Ziba deceived him, and slandered him to the king. Whereupon David exclaims, 'Why shouldst thou talk any further? I have declared it, thou and Ziba shall divide the fields.' Thus the son of Jonathan is shown kindness on account of his father, and Ziba keeps only half the reward of his treachery.[23]

We have now before us the last page concerning David's dealings with the house of Saul. The historian, blind to the patent fact that fear of pretenders of the house of Saul—the lame and abject Mephibosheth alone appearing harmless—induced his model of kings to commit a most horrid crime, and throw the responsibility for it on Jehovah and a poor remnant of a Canaanitish tribe, gives us the following account:[24] There was a famine in the days of David three years, year after year. The king inquired of Jehovah, and Jehovah answered, 'It is for Saul, and for his bloody house, because he slew the Gibeonites.' Now the Gibeonites were a

[23] II. Sam. ix., xvi. 1–4, xix. 25–31 (24–30).

[24] II. Sam. xxi. 1–14.

remnant of the Amorites, and the Israelites had bound themselves by oath to them, but Saul in his zeal sought to slay them. David now asked the Gibeonites, 'What shall I do for you, and wherewith shall I make atonement, that ye may bless Jehovah's possession?' The Gibeonites demanded the surrender to them of seven of Saul's sons, that they might hang them as a sacrifice to Jehovah, in Saul's own town Gibeah. And David said, 'I will give them.' But he spared Mephibosheth, on account of the oath which bound him to his father Jonathan; and he took the two sons of Saul by his concubine Rizpah and the five sons of one of his daughters,[25] and delivered them into the hands of the Gib-

[25] The Hebrew text has, 'the five sons of Michal, Saul's daughter, whom she had borne (*yāl'dāh*) to Adriel, the son of Barzillai, the Meholathite,' and thus makes David the murderer of five sons of his own wife; but, fortunately, it is easy to prove that the name Michal stands here by mistake for Merab. For Michal, while her father persecuted David, was given by the former to Phalti, or Phaltiel, the son of Laish, of Gallim (I. Sam. xxv. 44; II. Sam. iii. 15), and it was her elder sister Merab who was married to Adriel the Meholathite (I. Sam. xviii. 19). To reconcile the various texts, the Targum to II. Sam. xxi. 9 (8) makes Michal the bringer up of the five sons of Merab, and the Authorized Version follows its example, translating 'the five sons of Michal the daughter of Saul, whom she brought up for Adriel the son of Barzillai the Meholathite.' David's slaughter of the innocents, however, evidently embraced no children that could in any way be called 'the sons of Michal,' his wife. Her name is actually not given in this connection in the Syriac and Arabic versions, and Kennicott knew two Hebrew codices which distinctly substituted 'Merab.'

conites, and they hanged them on the hill before Jehovah.

After this review, is it still necessary to ask, Can David be considered the author of the elegy on Saul and Jonathan ?

But if David is not its author, who composed it ? Possibly a man who knew and did love the heroes who fell at Gilboa, and in whose song a later writer, who had the legend of Jonathan's extraordinary friendship before him, inserted the lines referring to it ; more probably, a man of a much later age, who sang ancient history in the purest strains of a literary generation.

XXI.

David, whatever his vices and crimes may have been, was a great monarch. He was brave, energetic, warlike. The consolidation and aggrandizement of his kingdom was his constant aim. He employed in his service men of ability and vigor, created a powerful army, and in Joab possessed a great general. Victory crowned his campaigns. He conquered the future capital of his country, and vanquished the Philistines, the Syrians, Moab, Edom, and Ammon. He promoted the worship of Jehovah, patronized prophets and priests, and paved the way for the erection of the temple of Zion. He founded a dynasty which reigned upward of four hundred years. When this dynasty decayed, he naturally became the great kingly hero upon whom the patriotic and pious looked back with ardent veneration. He became the model king of history, and by his standard—a partly fictitious standard—the merits of his successors were measured. His crimes were palliated. His legendary exploits and excellences were epically expanded. Creations of his successors were ascribed to him. Artistic inventions and literary productions of more refined ages than his were attributed to himself or to the singers and poets of his court. He was then not only a great conqueror and ruler: he was a poet and musi-

cal genius, an organizer of choirs and inventor of vocal instruments, a composer of hymns and religious instructor. Psalms in which really God-fearing men, on or near the tottering throne of Judah, poured out their feelings of adoration, of gratitude and hope, or of repentance, were inscribed with his name. Each successive generation added to these prayers or psalms of David, until, when the sacred literary collections of Israel were closed—centuries after the extinction of the Davidic dynasty—their number exceeded threescore and ten, according to the superscriptions.[1]

The worthlessness of these superscriptions has been fully established. Nor was it a difficult task for criticism to do it. Not a single one of the psalms ascribed to David contains distinct allusions to events in his life. Hardly any of them agree with his character and disposition as manifested in the historical sketches of the books of Samuel. The sentiments and religious views expressed in all of them are those of a different age. Some refer clearly to times and circumstances other than his. Thus Psalm v., 'a psalm of David,' speaks of going into God's house, his 'holy temple'—which was erected by David's successor—and Psalm xiv., marked 'of David,' of Israel's salvation which is to come from Zion, when Jehovah brings his people back from 'captivity.' In Psalms xvi., xvii.,

[1] The number in the Hebrew canon is seventy-three, the Septuagint has some fifteen more.

xviii., and xix. David is—by the superscriptions—made to expatiate on his virtues, innocence, and godliness. The king who added Uriah's wife to his harem and kept her to his last hour, and whose court circle reeked with profligacy—remember the doings of Amnon and Absalom, his sons—is made to utter sentiments and boasts like the following: 'Jehovah is my special portion, my cup. . . . In the nights my reins admonish me. I set Jehovah before me constantly.' 'Thou [O God] probest my heart, visitest me in the night; thou triest me, and findest nothing; . . . my footsteps slip not.' 'Jehovah requites my righteousness, rewards me for the cleanness of my hands. For I have kept Jehovah's ways, have not wickedly turned from my God; all his decrees are before me, I put not away his statutes; I cling to him most faithfully, am on my guard against iniquity.' 'Jehovah's law is perfect, soul-refreshing. . . . Jehovah's judgments are true and righteous altogether. . . . And by them is thy servant warned; in keeping them there is great reward. Who perceives errors? Make thou me guiltless of secret failings.' In Psalm xxii., the great king who rendered Israel powerful and consolidated the national worship after centuries of anarchy and idolatry is made to speak thus: 'My God, my God, . . . our fathers trusted in thee; trusted, and were delivered by thee. They cried to thee, and were delivered; they trusted in thee, and were not

confounded. But I am a worm, and no man ; a reproach of men, despised by the people. All who see me laugh me to scorn. . . .' In Psalms xxiii. and xxvi. David pictures his idyllic felicity and utmost purity : 'Goodness and mercy follow me all the days of my life, and I dwell in the house of Jehovah forever.' 'I walk in my integrity, trust in Jehovah, and slide not. Examine me, Jehovah, and try me ; probe my reins and my heart. . . . I wash my hands in innocence ; I compass thy altar, O Jehovah. . . . I love the house thou dwellest in, the resting-place of thy majesty.' And the further we proceed in the examination the more striking becomes the contrast between the David of the books of Samuel, 'a thorough soldier, rude and fierce, and of vehement passions,' whose 'deeds give no sign of profound religious sentiment or of extraordinary spiritual attainments,' [2] and the David of the book of Psalms, a mixture of characters—for the songs ascribed to him are the productions of many authors —but uniformly God-fearing, relying on divine aid and mercy, delighting in righteousness, and abhorrent of sin, falsehood, and arrogance. The king who in Samuel is related to have sacrificed to Jehovah, on gibbets erected before him, seven sons and grandsons of Saul, in atonement of a crime once committed by that prince, is made to say to his God in Psalm xl., 'Sacrifice and offering thou desirest not : my ears hast thou opened ; burnt-

[2] Knappert, 'The Religion of Israel,' ch. ix.

offering and sin-offering thou demandest not;' and in Psalm li., 'Behold, thou desirest truth in the inward parts. . . . Thou desirest not sacrifice, that I should give it; thou delightest not in burnt-offering. God's sacrifices are a broken spirit; a broken and contrite heart, O God, thou despisest not.'

The order and superscriptions of the three psalms following the last referred to fully display the critical incapacity of the last redactors of the collection. Psalm lii. is stated to have been composed by David, when Doeg, the Edomite, betrayed to Saul his stay at the house of Ahimelech, and Psalm liv. when the Ziphites informed Saul that he was hiding among them; and between the two we find, as Psalm liii., marked 'of David,' a slightly altered copy of Psalm xiv., which, as we have seen, mentions the 'captivity.' And why does this piece of the older first book of the collection reappear here in the second? Simply because it begins with the words '*Nābāl* (the villain, the fool) says in his heart,' and a redactor thought he had before him invectives of David against Nabal of Carmel, the story of whom is narrated in I. Samuel between the account of the denunciation of Doeg and a chapter opening with the betrayal of the Ziphites.[3] Blind to its contents, including, as we have seen, a sigh for the restoration of Israel from captivity, he inserted it, or reinserted

[3] See I. Sam. xxii., xxv., and xxvi. 1.

it, at what he considered its right place in historical order. Similar blindness guided the redactors, men of a very late and most uncritical age, in ascribing psalms to Moses, to Ethan, to Heman, to Asaph, to Solomon.

Yet the traditional image of David created by the main tenor of the psalms marked with his name, by a few higher traits of him discernible in the narratives of the books of Samuel, and by the systematic sanctification of his character in Chronicles, has been so powerful a check in rightly defining his place in the ethical and literary development of his nation that even such critics of our times as Ewald, Hitzig, and Schrader[4] have still accepted his authorship of about a dozen psalms.

Among the very few accepted as Davidic by all the three critics just mentioned is Psalm xviii., mainly, it must be supposed, on account of its being also incorporated in II. Samuel;[5] for its contents befit neither David's character nor any situation in his life. The superscription, which states it to have been sung by David on the day when Jehovah saved him 'from all his enemies and from the hand of Saul' refutes itself, for there was no such day in the life of the Judæan king, whose perils, *beginning* with Saul's hostility, ended only with his life;

[4] See his edition of De Wette's 'Einleitung in das Alte Testament,' p. 522.

[5] xxii.

and the closing words, which speak of Jehovah's kindness to 'David and his posterity' distinctly enough point to a later king of the Davidic dynasty as author. E. Meier,[6] reviewing this and the other psalms claimed for David by Ewald, reaches the conclusion that there is not a single one in the whole collection which could be ascribed to him on good critical grounds. And the Dutch school of criticism fully indorses this view. 'Probably not one of the psalms is from David's hand,' says Kuenen.[7] Oort, in showing the 'impossibility' of reconciling the David of Psalms with the David of history, remarks,[8] 'The superscriptions of the psalms are entirely untrustworthy; and the poems themselves date from periods at which the Israelites had pondered far more deeply upon the nature of true piety, and cherished far other thoughts as to phenomena of spiritual life, than was the case in David's time.' 'It is highly probable,' says Knappert,[9] 'that not one of the seventy-three psalms that bear his name is really his.'

The son of Jesse being thus fairly stripped of his laurels as a psalmist, we may also presume that the psalm-like song given in the twenty-third chapter of

[6] 'Geschichte der poetischen National-Literatur der Hebräer,' pp. 117–152.

[7] 'The Religion of Israel,' vol. i. p. 273.

[8] 'The Bible for Young People,' part i. book iii. ch. vi.

[9] *L. c.*

II. Samuel [10] does not contain 'the last words of David,' but words of a more righteous later king, to the beginning of which a redactor unguardedly prefixed, by way of explanation, 'This is the utterance of David, the son of Jesse.'

[10] Vv. 1-7.

NOTES.

A.

(See above, p. 2.)

THE rendering of *shib'āthayim* by *sevenfold*, instead of by *twice-sevenfold*, though ancient and generally adopted, is erroneous. The same is the case with the rendering of *arba'tayim* (II. Sam. xii. 6), which ought to be *twice-fourfold*, instead of *fourfold*, and of *kiphlayim* (Is. xl. 2 and Job xi. 6), which ought to be *twice-double*, instead of *double*. *Shib'āthayim*, the dual of *shib'āh*, seven, sevenfold, signifies *twice seven*, *twice-sevenfold*, just as *māthayim*, the dual of *mēāh*, hundred, signifies *two hundred*; *alpayim*, the dual of *eleph*, thousand, *two thousand*; and *ribbōthayim*, the dual of *ribbō*, ten thousand, *twice ten thousand*. *Shnayim*, fem. *shtayim*, two, is a natural dual, the original form of which was probably *'asht'nayim*, twice one; *'ishtin* being the Assyrian for *one*, and *'ashtē* added to *'āsār*, ten, forming the archaic Hebrew for *eleven*. The commonest hyperbolical number of the Hebrews was seven (m. *shib'āh*, f. *sheba'*); in ascending exaggeration they used the numbers twice seven, seventy, seventy-seven (twice-sevenfold, etc.). Seventeen, seven times seven, twice seventy, seven times seventy, and seventy times seventy were not used, as the corresponding Hebrew numerals could not be formed without adding or inserting a word of different stem and sound: *'āsār*, ten, or *p''āmīm*, times. *Shib'āh* or *sheba'*, in the sense of sevenfold, occurs in Gen. iv. 24 ('Lamech seventy-sevenfold') and four times in Lev. xxvi.

('sevenfold for your sins'). *Shib'āthayim* occurs altogether six times in the Bible, and in each instance the rendering *twice-sevenfold* is perfectly admissible: twice-sevenfold shall be the punishment of the murderer of Cain (Gen. iv. 15 and 24); twice-sevenfold the light of the sun (Is. xxx. 26); God's words are as pure as silver purified twice seven times (Ps. xii. 76); twice-sevenfold retribution shall be meted out to the insolent neighbors of Israel (Ps. lxxix. 12); twice-sevenfold restitution the thief would make to escape shame (Prov. vi. 31). The context in Is. xxx. 26 misled early translators and expounders, whose error became decisive. The sentence runs thus: 'The light of the sun shall be *shib'āthayim*, as the light of *shib'ath hayyāmīm*,' which last words were rendered *seven days*. But *shib'ath hayyāmīm* is *the seven days*, and the meaning of the sentence may be this: the light of the sun will be brilliant beyond expression, as it was in the sun's earliest prime, in the week of creation. (For another explanation see Maimonides, 'Moreh,' ii. 29.) Equally misleading was the context in which *arba'tayim* appears, which occurs only once. The prophet Nathan (II. Sam. xii) relates to King David the stealing of a lamb, and the king declares that it must be restored *arba'tayim*. This word, though the distinct dual of *arba'āh*, four, was explained to mean *fourfold*, in accordance with the law of Exodus, which orders the restoration of five oxen for a stolen ox, and of 'four sheep for a sheep.' What was not sufficiently considered is that Nathan told the story of a poor man's only lamb, which he loved as his own child, and of which he was robbed by a rich man, who owned many flocks and herds; that David, in his anger, so far exceeded the dictates

of the law that he swore by God that the heartless rich criminal must die ; and that, when he declared that, in addition, he should restore the lamb *arba'tayim*, he meant to procure the cruelly despoiled poor man an extra-legal compensation for his loss. Kimhi saw this clearly.

B.

(See p 23.)

Gad is mentioned in Is. lxv. 11 (Hebrew text) as a divinity worshipped by Jewish idolaters together with Meni ; the word is combined with Baal in the name of a place in the valley of Lebanon (Josh. xi. 17, and elsewhere). Genesis (xxx. 11) derives the name of the tribal ancestor from *gād*, good fortune, happiness ; Baal-Gad was probably a god of happiness. The name of the idol Meni may possibly be contained, as Bernstein presumes, in that of Benjamin. Asher reminds us forcibly of the goddess Asherah, and it is not to be overlooked that side by side with the pl. f. *ăshērōth*, referring to the images of that divinity, there is also a pl. m., *ăshērīm*, nor that Asur (Asshur)—'the benign,' according to Schrader and others—was the principal god of Assyria. Zebulun, or Zebulon—there is a derivative *z'būlōnī*—is, perhaps, a compound of *z'būl*, habitation, and On (*ōn*), the Hebrew form of the Egyptian word for *light, sun*, which is the Scriptural name of Heliopolis, the city of the Sun, in Egypt. There was also a city of the Sun, Beth-Shemesh, on the confines of Zebulun and Issachar (Josh. xix. 22) ; and the valley of Aven spoken of by Amos (i. 5) may be properly a valley of On, as the Septuagint has it —possibly the valley of Heliopolis in Cœle-Syria—since Ezekiel (xxx. 17) uses Aven, instead of On, also of the

Egyptian Heliopolis. As Josephus renders the name Reuben uniformly *Rubelos*, and the Syriac version *Rūbīl*, it is presumed by some that the original appellation of that tribe included the word Baal, in a modified form, or Bel. Dan, a name meaning *judge*, may also have had reference to a god, a supposition which finds support in Dan-Jaan, the name of a place (II. Sam. xxiv. 6), signifying *Dan may answer*, or *Dan answers*. Ephraim is properly derived in Genesis (xli. 52) from a word denoting fertility. Rich crops, the husbandman's reward, may be alluded to in the name Issachar, which signifies *brings compensation* (*yissā sākhār*) or *there is compensation* (*yēsh sākhār*); in the canton of Issachar was the fertile valley of Jezreel, the name of which denotes God's sowing.

C.

(See p. 41.)

'In the A. V. of the Bible, Shiloh is used as the name of a person. . . . Supposing that the translation is correct, the meaning of the word is Peaceable, or Pacific, and the allusion is either to Solomon, whose name has a similar signification, or to the expected Messiah, who in Is. ix. 6 is expressly called the Prince of Peace. . . . But . . . if the original Hebrew text is correct as it stands, there are three objections to this translation, which, taken collectively, seem fatal to it. 1st. The word Shiloh occurs nowhere else in Hebrew as the name or appellation of a person. 2dly. The only other Hebrew word, apparently, of the same form, is Giloh (Josh. xv. 51; 2 Sam. xv. 12); this is the name of a city, and not of a person. 3dly. By translating the word as it is translated

everywhere else in the Bible, namely, as the name of the city in Ephraim where the ark of the covenant remained during such a long period, a sufficiently good meaning is given to the passage without any violence to the Hebrew language, and, indeed, with a precise grammatical parallel elsewhere (compare וַיָּבֹא שִׁלֹה 1 Sam. iv. 12). The simple translation is, "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor the ruler's staff from between his feet, till he shall go to Shiloh." . . . The above translation . . . was first suggested by Teller, . . . and it has since found favor with learned men belonging to various schools of theology, such as Eichhorn, Hitzig, Tuch, Bleek, Ewald, Delitzsch, Rödiger, Kalisch, Luzzatto, and Davidson." (Art. 'Shiloh' in Smith's 'Dictionary of the Bible.') The authorities referred to here agree with Samuel ben Meir, whose explanation is given above, only in regard to the meaning of the word Shiloh, but not to the allusion hidden in the sentence. According to them the primacy of Judah in war is alluded to, which ceased with the conquest of the Promised Land and the deposition of the ark at Shiloh. But Judah led in the war of conquest only on account of greater numbers, and enjoyed no supremacy or privilege of any kind.

D.

(See p. 41.)

The word *yiqhāh*, which occurs only twice in the Scriptures, is, in the Authorized Version, rendered here *gathering*, and in Prov. xxx. 17 taken as signifying *obedience*, for which others have *wrinkles* (gathering of the skin). Each rendering is supported by eminent expounders, yet the former alone agrees with the tenor of the verse in Proverbs,

where it is rejected by the Authorized Version. There is no sense in a sentence like this: The eye that mocks at a father, and despises *to obey* a mother, shall be picked out by the ravens of the valley. What has the eye to do with *obedience?* Besides, to twist *yiqq'hath ēm*, the *yiqhāh of* a mother, into *obedience to* a mother is a violent proceeding. The sense which the other explanation gives is perfect: The eye that looks with scorn at a (decrepit) father, and with contempt at the wrinkles of a mother, shall be picked out, etc. And to this we find an exact parallel in Prov. xxiii. 22: 'Despise not thy mother when she is old.' *Yiqhāh* is thus related in meaning as well as sound to the Hebrew verbs *qāvāh* and *qāhal*, both signifying *to gather*. It is even more closely related to Jakeh (Heb. *yāqeh*), the name of the father of Agur, the author or collector of sayings (Prov. xxx. 1), 'a name that appears to be symbolic like that of the son' (Fürst, under '*yāqeh*'), which, in its turn, signifies *gatherer* or *collector*, from *āgar*, to gather, to collect, like Qoheleth, from *qāhal*. The superscription 'words of Agur, the son of Jakeh,' is equivalent to this: Sayings of Collector, the son of Gatherer.

E.

(See p. 82.)

THE verb *lāka'h* in the original is not to be taken in the sense of receiving or accepting as an instruction ('*cf. leka'h, Annahme, Lehre*'—Knobel), but in that of perceiving or taking with the ear, as in Job iv. 12, 'my ear took,' that is, heard, as Gesenius translates it *s. v.* In other words, *lāka'h*, the common translation of which in German is *nehmen*, to take, is not to be rendered here by *annehmen*, to accept,

but by *vernehmen*, to hear. The Latin translation would be *accipere*, as in 'carmen chordasque loquentis auribus accipere' (Lucretius, iv. 978, 979), or in 'Accipe nunc Danaum insidias' (Virgil, Aen. ii. 65). *Lāka'h* seems to have the same meaning in all the following passages: Ex. xxii. 10 (11) (translate, *the owner of it shall hear it, viz.*, the oath); Num. xvi. 1 (*Now Korah . . . heard it, viz.*, the report of the putting to death, by the direction of Moses, of a man who committed no greater offence than gathering pieces of wood on the sabbath day);[1] I. Sam. xx. 21 (*If I expressly say to the lad, 'Behold, the arrows are on this side of thee,' hear it, and come*);[2] Jer. xv. 15 (*revenge me of my persecutors, hear me not in thy long-suffering*); Jer. xxiii. 30, 31 ('*I am against the prophets,' says Jehovah, 'who steal my words one from another;' 'behold, I am against the prophets,' says Jehovah, 'who hear their language, and utter an oracle'*); Ez. xxxvi. 30 (*that ye shall hear no more the reproach of famine*); Ps. vi. 10 (9) (*Jehovah listens to my supplication, Jehovah hears my prayer*); Ps. xlix. 16 (15) (*God redeems my soul from the power of the grave, for he hears me*). For the principal part of these remarks, which suggested the rest, the writer is indebted to oral information obtained many years ago from a Hebraist of Warsaw.

[1] The account of this event, given in the preceding chapter, was probably not originally divided, by the five verses now following it, from the story of the rising of Korah and his associates against the sway of Moses.

[2] Mark the construction in the original: אם אמר אמר . . . הנה . . . קחנו ובאה . . . החצים, to which the common translation does double violence.

F.

(See p. 117.)

Amended text:	Masoretic text:
יְחִי רְאוּבֵן וְאַל־יָמֹת	יְחִי רְאוּבֵן וְאַל־יָמֹת
וְיִהִי מְתָיו מִסְפָּר	וְיִהִי מְתָיו מִסְפָּר
	וְזֹאת לִיהוּדָה וַיֹּאמַר
שְׁמַע יְהוָה קוֹל שִׁמְעוֹן	שְׁמַע יְהוָה קוֹל יְהוּדָה
וְאֶל־עַמּוֹ תְּבִיאֶנּוּ	וְאֶל־עַמּוֹ תְּבִיאֶנּוּ
	יָדָיו רָב לוֹ
	וְעֵזֶר מִצָּרָיו תִּהְיֶה
	וּלְלֵוִי אָמַר
תֻּמֶּיךָ וְאוּרֶיךָ	תֻּמֶּיךָ וְאוּרֶיךָ
לְלֵוִי אִישׁ חֲסִידֶךָ	לְאִישׁ חֲסִידֶךָ
אֲשֶׁר נִסִּיתוֹ בְּמַסָּה	אֲשֶׁר נִסִּיתוֹ בְּמַסָּה
תְּרִיבֵהוּ עַל־מֵי מְרִיבָה	תְּרִיבֵהוּ עַל־מֵי מְרִיבָה
הָאֹמֵר לְאָבִיו וּלְאִמּוֹ	הָאֹמֵר לְאָבִיו וּלְאִמּוֹ
לֹא רְאִיתִיו	לֹא רְאִיתִיו
וְאֶת־אֶחָיו לֹא הִכִּיר	וְאֶת־אֶחָיו לֹא הִכִּיר
וְאֶת־בָּנָיו לֹא יָדָע	וְאֶת־בָּנ(י)ו לֹא יָדָע
כִּי שָׁמְרוּ אִמְרָתֶךָ	כִּי שָׁמְרוּ אִמְרָתֶךָ

וּבְרִיתְךָ יִנְצֹרוּ
יוֹרוּ מִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ לְיַעֲקֹב
וְתוֹרָתְךָ לְיִשְׂרָאֵל
יָשִׂימוּ קְטוֹרָה בְּאַפֶּךָ
וְכָלִיל עַל־מִזְבְּחֶךָ

יְהוּדָה יָדָיו רָב לוֹ
וְעֵזֶר מִצָּרָיו תִּהְיֶה
בָּרֵךְ יְהוָה חֵילוֹ
וּפֹעַל יָדָיו תִּרְצֶה
מְחַץ מָתְנַיִם קָמָיו
וּמְשַׂנְאָיו מִן־יְקוּמוּן

לְבִנְיָמִן אָמַר
יְדִיד יְהוָה
יִשְׁכֹּן לָבֶטַח עָלָיו
חֹפֵף עָלָיו כָּל־הַיּוֹם
וּבֵין כְּתֵפָיו שָׁכֵן

וּלְיוֹסֵף אָמַר
מְבֹרֶכֶת יְהוָה אַרְצוֹ
מִמֶּגֶד שָׁמַיִם מֵעָל
וּמִתְּהוֹם רֹבֶצֶת תָּחַת...

וּלְזִבוּלֻן אָמַר

שְׂמַח זְבוּלֻן בְּצֵאתֶךָ שְׂמַח זְבוּלֻן בְּצֵאתֶךָ
וְיִשָּׂשכָר בְּאָהָלֶיךָ··· וְיִשָּׂשכָר בְּאָהָלֶיךָ···

וּלְגָד אָמַר

בָּרוּךְ מַרְחִיב גָּד בָּרוּךְ מַרְחִיב גָּד
כְּלָבִיא שָׁכֵן כְּלָבִיא שָׁכֵן
וְטָרַף זְרוֹעַ אַף־קָדְקֹד··· וְטָרַף זְרוֹעַ אַף־קָדְקֹד···

וּלְדָן אָמַר

דָּן גּוּר אַרְיֵה דָּן גּוּר אַרְיֵה
יְזַנֵּק מִן־הַבָּשָׁן יְזַנֵּק מִן־הַבָּשָׁן

וּלְנַפְתָּלִי אָמַר

נַפְתָּלִי שְׂבַע רָצוֹן נַפְתָּלִי שְׂבַע רָצוֹן
וּמָלֵא בִּרְכַּת יְהוָה וּמָלֵא בִּרְכַּת יְהוָה
יָם וְדָרוֹם יְרָשָׁה יָם וְדָרוֹם יְרָשָׁה

וּלְאָשֵׁר אָמַר

בָּרוּךְ מִבָּנִים אָשֵׁר בָּרוּךְ מִבָּנִים אָשֵׁר
יְהִי רָצוּי אֶחָיו··· יְהִי רָצוּי אֶחָיו···

C.

(See p. 141.)

Both *çedeq* and *ç'dāqāh* are often used in the sense of *deliverance, victory, salvation,* or *prosperity.* The verb *çādaq* signifies *to be right, to be just, to be righteous;* hence *to be right* in a controversy or a contest ('Behold, in this thou art not right,' Job xxxiii. 12; 'She is more right than I,' Gen. xxxviii. 26), *to be victorious* ('Through Jehovah shall be victorious' . . ., Is. xlv. 25). *Hiçdīq* signifies *to make* or *declare* (*one*) *right, innocent,* or *victorious* ('I will not make the wicked right,' Ex. xxiii. 7; 'He who declares the wicked right . . .,' Prov. xvii. 15). The opposite of this is *hirshīa', to make* or *declare wrong* or *guilty, to condemn* ('they shall . . . condemn the wicked,' Deut. xxv. 1), *to discomfit, to vanquish* ('every tongue that rises against thee in judgment thou shalt discomfit,' Is. liv. 17; 'whithersoever he turned, he vanquished,' I. Sam. xiv. 47). *Çaddīq* is he who is *righteous, right* in a controversy ('The first in a cause is right,' Prov. xviii. 17), or *victorious* in a conflict ('Behold, thy king comes to thee, victorious and saved,' Zech. ix. 9; 'Can booty be taken from a hero, or a victor's capture be snatched,' Is. xlix. 24). '*Çaddīq,*' says Hitzig (on Is. xxiv. 16), 'is *he who in the conflict,* which is an ordeal, *proves himself right, victorious, a victor.*' And he adds, 'In the same way *çedeq* is *victory.*' In this or a very similar meaning *çedeq* and *çdāqāh* (which generally designate *righteousness, justice*) are to be taken in Is. xli. 2 ('Who has roused him from the East whom victory meets at every step?'), Is. xlv. 24 ('in Je-

hovah . . . is victory and strength '), Is. li. 5 (' My victory is near, my deliverance has gone forth'), Is. xli. 10, Is. xlvi. 13, Is. li. 6, Is. lviii. 8, Is. lxi. 10, Is. lxii. 1, 2, Jer. xxxiii. 16, Ps. iv. 21, Ps. cxxxii. 9, and in several other passages. Knobel (on Is. xli. 2) considers *çedeq* to designate *victory* or *salvation* because victory and salvation spring from justice and righteousness; Delitzsch (on the same verse), though clinging to the primary meaning, *justice*, sees in *çedeq* also ' the victory which procures justice for the just cause of the combatant.' Gesenius (in the introduction to the second volume of his Isaiah) renders *çedeq* by '*salvation, help, deliverance, victory,*' meanings applying also to *yesha'* and *y'shūa'*, with which *çedeq* and *ç'dāqāh* often stand in parallelism.

H.

(See p. 160.)

THE following are brief fragments of a lengthy memorial inscription of Thothmes III., ' literally translated ' by Brugsch:

" Befehl gab [der König]

" zu einer Berathung mit seinen Kriegern wegen des Krieges, indem er also redete : Jener feindliche König

" von Kadeschu ist angelangt. Er ist eingezogen in Makitha (Megiddo). Er befindet sich [daselbst]

" in diesem Augenblicke. Er hat zu sich versammelt die Könige [aller] Völker, [welche wohnen]

" gegen das Wasser von Aegypten hin bis zum Lande Naharain.

. . . . . .

" Eine breite Strasse geht von 'Aluna aus. . . .

" [Lasst uns gehn auf derselben, wir werden hervor-] kommen bei

" Ta-'an-na-ka (Thaanach).

" Es war dahin gerollt

" die Sonne, da hatte der König erreicht den Süden von Megiddo an dem Ufer des Baches Qinaa (Kanah).

. . . . . .

" Das Horn der Krieger des Königs an dem südlichen Berge [befand sich am Bache], ... das nördliche Horn im Nordwesten von Megiddo, der König in ihrer Mitte . . .

" Da bemächtigte sich der König ihrer. . . . Da nahmen sie kopfüber die Flucht nach Megiddo zu, in ihrem Angesichte das Entsetzen, und liessen im Stich ihre Pferde und ihre goldenen und silbernen Wagen . . .

" der elende König von Kadesch sammt dem elenden Könige dieser Stadt (Megiddo). . . .

" Da wurden erbeutet ihre Pferde, ihre goldenen und silbernen Wagen. . . .

" Die tapferen Kriegshaufen des Königs zählten nach die Dinge derselben.

. . . . . .

" *Verzeichniss der Beute:*

. . . . . .

1 Wagen, beschlagen mit Gold, auch der Kasten von Gold, dem feindlichen König gehörig,

[31] Wagen, beschlagen mit Gold, des Königs von . . .,

892 Wagen seiner elenden Krieger,

---

924 zusammen."

END OF VOL. I.

S. W. Green's Type-Setting Machinery, 16 and 18 Jacob Street, New York.

SUPPLEMENTARY REMARK.

To page 19.

'Isaiah,' etc., refers, of course, only to the genuine pieces of that prophet, and not to chapters xl–lxvi. of the book which bears his name. As to Is. xxix. 22, see Wellhausen, 'Geschichte Israels,' vol. i. p. 373: 'In Isa. 29, 22 "drum so spricht Jahve zum Hause Jakobs der Abraham erlöste: nicht braucht sich Jakob jetzt zu schämen," haben die gesperrten Worte, wenn man sie nicht mit der LXX gewaltsam misdeutet, keine mögliche Stelle im Satze. Ausserdem kommt die Vorstellung von der Erlösung Abrahams (aus dem Feuer der Chaldäer) erst spät vor.' The verse must be compared in its strange original wording, which the Authorized Version does not reflect.

CORRECTION..

To page 109.

In line 2 read: upon the head of the crowned one.